THE INFLUENCE OF AUGUSTINE OF HIPPO ON THE ORTHODOX CHURCH

Michael Azkoul

Text and Studies in Religion
Volume 56

The Edwin Mellen Press
Lewiston/Queenston/Lampeter

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Azkoul, Michael.
The influence of Augustine of Hippo on the Orthodox Church.
p. cm. -- (Texts and studies in religion ; v. 56)
Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN 0-88946-733-1
1. Augustine, Saint, Bishop of Hippo--Influence. 2. Orthodox Eastern Church--Doctrines--History. I. Title. II. Series: Texts and studies in religion ; 56.
BR1720.A9A95 1991
230' .19' 09--dc20 91-2156
CIP

This is volume 56 in the continuing series
Texts and Studies in Religion
Volume 56 ISBN 0-88946-733-1
TSR Series ISBN 0-88946-976-8

A CIP catalog record for this book is available
from The British Library.

Copyright ©1990 Michael Azkoul.

All rights reserved. For more information contact

The Edwin Mellen Press
P.O. Box 450
Lewiston, NY 14092
USA

The Edwin Mellen Press
Box 67
Queenston, Ontario
CANADA L0S 1L0

The Edwin Mellen Press, Ltd.
Lampeter, Dyfed, Wales
UNITED KINGDOM SA48 7DY

Printed in the United States of America

THE INFLUENCE OF AUGUSTINE OF HIPPO ON THE ORTHODOX CHURCH

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE i

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS iii

INTRODUCTION 1

CHAPTER I AUGUSTINE AND HIS INFLUENCE 17

1. The Life and Times of Augustine 17
2. The Authority of Augustine in the West 32
3. The Authority of Augustine in the East 46

CHAPTER II THE PATRISTIC WITNESS 73

1. The Fathers of the West 73
2. The Fathers of the East 96

CHAPTER III PLATONISM: THE PHILOSOPHY OF AUGUSTINE 128

1. Faith and Reason 129
2. Religio-Philosophical Themes 139
3. Augustine and Neo-Platonism 141
4. Wisdom and Being: *St Gregory of Nyssa* 152

CHAPTER IV AUGUSTINE: ORIGINAL SIN, GRACE AND PREDESTINATION 180

1. Origen and Augustine 181
2. Original Sin 186
3. Predestination 190
4. Grace and Free Will 197

CHAPTER V AUGUSTINE: THE OTHER ERRORS 221

1. The Mind of the Church 222
2. Christology 227
3. Soteriology: *St Ambrose and St Leo* 231
4. The Church 234
5. The Mysteries 238
6. Theophanies and the Vision of God 246

CONCLUSION 265

BIBLIOGRAPHY 275

INDEX 291

Preface

There are very few persons in church history about whom more has been written than Augustine of Hippo. So important a figure is he that his theology is ordinarily perceived to be the supreme articulation of the Christian Faith. Thus, an attack on Augustine is commonly taken as an attack upon Christianity herself; and to abandon Augustinianism is to abandon the Church. What would Alcuin of York, John Scotus Erigena, Anselm of Canterbury, Bernard of Clairvaux, Thomas Aquinas, Martin Luther and the Protestant Reformation have been without him? What the theosophic tradition of the West? What Descartes, Malbranche, Pascal, Spinoza, Leibniz, Kant, Hegel, etc.?

Indeed, so much a part of Western culture and civilization is the thought of Augustine, that the abolition of Augustinianism would necessarily revolutionize Western principles and values. Such precisely has been the aim of secular modernity, since at least the 19th century, if we may believe Professor H.D. Aiken of Harvard. Modernity long ago renounced any hope of reconciling "reason" and "revelation" and, therefore, the numerous proponents of secularism view their major task as "the reinterpretation of the basic institutions and symbols of Western religion in such a way as to render them expressive of the predicaments of

modern man" ("Philosophy and Ideology in the Nineteenth Century," *The Age of Ideology*, New York, 1956, pp. 25-26).

All revolutions begin with an attack upon traditional values and, in the West, religion is their source, a religion which has been for more than a millennium unthinkable without Augustine of Hippo. I would venture to say that his influence has been so pervasive --- often tacit, sometimes hidden --- that Augustinianism is the chief obstacle to the total secularization of Western life and thought. Why else, for example, has the "liberation of history from theology" customarily begin with an attack upon Augustine's *City of God*, as Professor Meyerhoff observes in his Introduction to *The Philosophy of History in Our Time* (Garden City, NY, 1959)?

Nevertheless, there is a fundamental error here; and it is for an Orthodox Christian to make it clear: the refutation of Augustinianism does not constitute a refutation of Christianity; neither does his preservation assure the salvation of the West. In fact, his philosophical religion is a perversion of the Christian revelation. He is also responsible, in large measure, for the division between East and West; and, indeed, even for the Occident's loss of the patristic spirit.

The Christian truth is found in the much misunderstood witness of the Church Fathers --- not, however, the "fathers" as classified and analyzed by contemporary historical science, a science which acts as a barrier to the right understanding of them. So long as human existence and destiny are perceived as wholly natural and immanent, as most modern scholarship would have it, the experience and wisdom of the Fathers

will have very little to recommend them.

Unlike secular modernity, too, the Orthodox Church accepts the unity of the patristic witness, that is, a witness to an immutable theological Tradition whose only source is the Christ and the Apostles. Consequently, she denies that her doctrine evolved piecemeal under the auspices of the Fathers who, with the help of pagan learning, gradually altered "the simple gospel of Jesus Christ." Also, the value of Hellenism was to the Fathers, as it is to the Church, an instrument of discernment, not a tool of discovery.

Finally, the differences between the Fathers, Latin, Greek, Oriental and Russian, are superficial, the result of circumstance and local need. Augustine, however, does not belong to that "blessed fraternity," if I may borrow Plato's expression. There is good reason that Orthodoxy has never recognized him as a Father of the Church --- his latter-day champions notwithstanding; and, certainly not a "super-Father," as he has been known in the West since the Carolingian period. He is surely not the apex of the patristic tradition; in fact, he was the beginning of something new. Such is the burden of this study to demonstrate.

Acknowledgements

I am grateful to Fr Panagiotes Carras of Toronto, Canada, Fr Patric Ranson of the *Fraternité Orthodoxe St Gregoire Palamas* in Paris, France; and Hieromonk Haralampos and Fr Gabriel of the Holy Transfiguration

Orthodox Monastery in Brookline, Massachusetts for their advice and criticism. To Dr George Vaughn, I am indebted for the laser-printing of the manuscript. To his wife, Larissa, and to my Presbytera Theodora goes the credit for the careful and painstaking proofreading of the text.

Introduction

I first encountered the writings of Augustine, Bishop of Hippo, during my school days. I was attending Calvin College, a small and underrated liberal arts institution in Grand Rapids, Michigan. He was part of my studies in medieval philosophy and the professor was passionately his man, especially of Augustine's *Confessions* from which he read to the class aloud; and not without emotion. The Bishop of Hippo was invariably compared, favorably, to John Calvin, a comparison which was to give me an appreciation of Gibbon's words, "the church of Rome has canonized Augustine and reprobated Calvin. Yet, the real difference between them is invisible even to a theological microscope."[1]

At the time, Gibbon's remarks did not seem exaggerated; and to this day, I do not believe he missed the mark by much. Yet, we know that Augustine, unlike Calvin, espoused the sacerdotal priesthood and a system of rites and statutes completely foreign to the mind of the Reformer. That difference with Calvin only endeared Augustine to me the more. Of course, my Calvinist teachers ignored his "ecclesiasticism" and expounded the side of Augustine most amenable to their creed.

Later, while attending St Vladimir's Russian Orthodox Theological Seminary in New York City, I

continued to read Augustine with great pleasure. I had come to agree with the medieval theologian, Peter the Venerable, that the Bishop of Hippo was the highest authority in the Church after the Apostles --- *maximus post apostolis ecclesiarum instructor*; and with Luther, "When Augustine is eliminated from the list of the Fathers, the others are not worth much."[2]

Nothing I learned at the seminary led me to alter my thinking; not at first. The Dean of St Vladimir's, the late Dr Georges Florovsky, esteemed Augustine highly --- his authorship of the *filioque* notwithstanding. After all, Florovsky said, many of the Fathers erred in some way: were not Sts Justin Martyr and Irenaeos chiliasts and St Gregory of Nyssa a follower of Origen? Did not St Gregory the Great espouse a doctrine of purgatory? And more to the point, had not St Photios addressed Augustine as "saint" and "father" and St Mark of Ephesos and St Gennadios Scholarios paid him homage?

Nearly two decades were to pass before my assumptions about Augustine --- and the Fathers --- were seriously challenged. The more I familiarized myself with their writings the more difficult it became for me to maintain my former appreciation of him. I was not alone. Orthodox writers began to publicly express reservations about the traditionalism of Augustine. To be sure, he was not without apologists, those who looked upon his opponents as "silly extremists" whose "Saint-bashing" was "the product not so much of theology as of hysteria."[3] One Orthodox priest described his "detractors" as "superficial," failing to recognize that the "errors" of Augustine --- his model of the Trinity, predestination, grace, etc. --- were not "heresies," but merely "exaggerations."[4]

As I continued to read Augustine and church history, his defenders became less and less convincing. The evidence did not support them. I could not reconcile the opinions of Augustine with the teachings of those Christian writers whom the Orthodox Church recognized as her spokesmen. Quite candidly, I had not studied Augustinianism carefully and, although I had lost my initial enthusiasm for him, I could not, in good conscience, make any final judgment concerning his theology.

Finally, I came across the translated works (from the Russian) of the New Martyr, Archbishop Hilarion Troitsky, who did not hesitate to quote the Western Fathers as authorities --- St Cyprian of Carthage, St Hilary of Poitiers, St Ambrose of Milan, St Gregory the Great ("the Dialogist"), etc. --- and sometimes Augustine himself, but without the familiar "saint" or "blessed." I was completely awakened from my dogmatic slumbers with his statement, "We can only thank God that the doctrine of the Eastern Church was formulated outside the sphere of Augustinianism, which we must consider as alien to us."[5]

Saint Hilarion, although conceding that Augustine was a religious writer of immense historical importance, refused to place him on the patristic roll. His attitude prompted me to examine the African's writings with more care; and I was persuaded by the literature that the Archbishop had not misspoken. I began to put critical evaluations of the Bishop of Hippo into print. One critical response came to me from a Greek Old Calendar bishop who sent me documents from the Synod of the Orthodox Church of Greece.

One of these documents was a tendentious report to the Synod entitled, "The Question of the Sanctity of

the Holy Augustine," the results of research by Fr Evangelos Mantzouneas which had also been serialized in the religious periodical *Phylakes* in 1977. I could not honestly argue that Mantzouneas had scrupulously and comprehensively investigated the matter.

According to Fr Evangelos, his paper was occasioned by the objections of "an Athenian lawyer" to the inclusion of "St Augustine's name" in the ecclesiastical calendar of the Greek Orthodox Church in 1968. His protest was made on the grounds that Augustine was guilty of numerous doctrinal errors and had no cultus in the Orthodox Church. Mantzouneas's report in hand, the Synod declared that he is clearly a "teacher and father of the Faith" or, to use the words of Fr Evangelos, "in Augustine we are dealing with a Saint of the Catholic Church from the 5th century." He contended, too, that the Orthodox Popes appealed to the authority of the great African prelate and praised his piety.

Moreover, Mantzouneas asserted, Augustine was proclaimed Saint and Father by the Ecumenical Councils of Chalcedon (451) and Trullo (553). The same judgment was made by the St Justinian the Emperor, St Photios of Constantinople, St Mark of Ephesos, St Gennadios Scholarios, Patriarch Dositheos of Jerusalem, Eustratios Argenti and, of course, St Nikodemos of the Holy Mountain. Augustine's name is also found in the diptychs of the Liturgy of St James, the Brother of the Lord.

Mantzouneas cautioned "the Athenian lawyer" not to be confused by Russian practice, common since the 18th century, of distinguishing between a "saint" and one, like Augustine, who is merely "blessed" (i.e., honored, but not canonized). He was admired by St

Dimitri of Rostov, St Tikhon of Zadonsk and Archbishop Philaret of Chernigov. Like them, the famous 19th century recluse, George of Zadonsk, lionized Augustine, being especially fond of his *Confessions* and *Soliloquies*. The Russian philosopher, Ivan Kierevsky, called him "a great teacher."

Mantzouneas might also have mentioned that Augustine's writings were read in Russian seminaries (especially in the Ukraine) during the 18th and 19th centuries, a part of the curriculum from the reign of Peter the Great. Theophan Prokopovich (1681-1736), his Archbishop and Dean of the Kiev Academy, is said to have possessed in his private library a dozen leather-bound editions of Augustine's works.[6]

The report to the Synod also hoped to show that Augustine has a cultus in the Church. In Rome's ancient temple of the Lateran hangs his icon, dating from the 6th century. An icon of "St Augustine" may be found in the Meteora monastery and another in Constantinople, painted in the 13th century. Moreover, a religious service to Augustine was composed by Iakobos the Athonite in 1861; and, after the Balkan Wars, Fr Ioannes Danielides (1914) wrote the same. In 1955, a Church Slavonic Canon was written by Hieromonk Ambrose Pogodin, as commissioned by the saintly John Maximovitch, the Archbishop of Brussels and Western Europe for the Russian Orthodox Church outside of Russia.

Furthermore, the name of Augustine had already appeared in the Greek *Synaxaristes* of St Nikodemos of the Holy Mountain (1749-1809).[7] It was he who assigned 15 June to him on the Church Calendar; hence, the short biography of Augustine on that date in Bishop Nikolai Velimirovic's *The Prologue from Ochrid* (pt. 2). His

Grace relates that Augustine became a Christian "through the advice, tears and prayers of his mother, Monica. He was a great Doctor of the Church an influential writer, but with certain unacceptable extremes in his teaching."

In 1893, Konstantinos Doukakis had included Nikodemos' memorial of Augustine in the tenth volume of his own *Synaxaristes*. Later, Victor Matthaios, deputy abbot of the Holy Transfiguration Monastery in Kronizi Koubara, placed the same memorial and a more extensive biography of the Bishop of Hippo in the *Megas Synaxaristes tes Orthodoxou Ekklesias* ([vol. 6]. Athens, 1950). The posthumous *Lives of the Saints of the Orthodox Church* by the former Metropolitan Sophronios Eustratiadis (d. 1947) includes a life of "St Augustine."

Convinced by such facts, the Rev James Thornton declares editorially in *The Orthodox Path* that the sanctity of Augustine is incontestable. Showing no evidence of having read him, Fr James offers as defense the familar caveat that "no Church Father ever attacked St Augustine. No Church Council, either Ecumenical or local, ever condemned him as a 'heretic' or 'father of heretics.' No competent theologian has ever made such false accusations, although it is true that several have pointed out, in a responsible manner, the 'errors' in the theology of St Augustine."[8] He apparently agrees with Fr Seraphim Rose that his "errors" were unintentional or the work of a redactor. In any case, one should not expect "precision" and "theoretical correctness," Rose warns, from anyone in a time of controversy. Often, too, his "errors" are simply the result of inadequate language and faulty conceptualization.[9]

Reading over the pro-Augustinian literature, I was struck by the fervor of his advocates. They are eager for a favorable resolution of all inquiries into the question of Augustine's sanctity. As in the case of the Greek Synod, "the rabbit is put into the hat." In truth, the *apologia* of Augustine's Orthodox protagonists commonly rests on a number of gratuitous assumptions, the consequence of their failure to critically assess Augustine theology and the errors attributed to him. No wonder that from the outset the case against him was presumed to be frivilous.

What are the "exaggerations" they acknowledge? The list predictably indexes the *filioque* and predestination and irresistible grace, and sometimes "original sin." Augustine's cataphaticism is generally ignored; and also his theory of Ideas and suspicious doctrine of creation; his crypto-Nestorian christology; his false mystagogy and understanding of Old Testament theophanies; his unorthodox ecclesiology; his philosophical conception of the soul; the *analogia entis*; his speculations on purgatory, the beatific vision, his questionable view of deification; his anthropology and peculiar teaching on sex.

Above all, his Orthodox champions provide us with no understanding of Augustine's Platonism. The litany of his "errors" is long and serious, but even they shrink before this "exaggeration." His Platonism accounts for the religious and philosophical questions he raised and the way in which he answered them. Herein, then, lies the basis of the accusation against him --- *Augustine, Bishop of Hippo, is not the climax of the patristic tradition, but the beginning of another.*

He became to the West what Origen failed to become

for the East --- "*l'horizon indepassable de la théologie.*"[10] The fundamental mistake of both men was their Platonism --- the Middle Platonism of Origen and the Neo-Platonism of Augustine. Their synthesis of Christianity and the *externa sapientia* is the dynamic of their theological and philosophical speculations, distorting Hellenism and enervating Christianity.[11]

Let us admit, however, that to call Augustine a "Platonist" is not to say that he embraced every philosophical principle propounded by his pagan teachers, not even those of Marius Victorinus whose triadology he adopted. Thus, Portalié, in his article "Augustine" for *Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique*,[12] enumerates the Platonic theories which the Bishop of Hippo rejected: eternity of the world, emanationism, pantheism, autosoterism, the pre-existence and the transmigration of the soul, and polytheism. Also, Augustine lamented that the Platonists were scandalized by the Incarnation of the Logos.

Portalié mentions, too, those Platonic theories which Augustine always approved and adapted to his Christianity: philosophy as *amor sapientiae*, with God and the soul as its object; the idea of the Good, the doctrine of "illumination" and the distinction between "intellection" (knowledge of eternal things) and "science" (knowledge of temporal things), corresponding to Plato's double-tiered reality; and, of course, the theory of eternal Ideas or Forms which Augustine placed in the Essence of God.[13]

Considering Augustine's thought as a whole, his mixing of Hellenism and Orthodoxy, his attempt to elevate "faith" into "reason," we can understand A.H. Armstrong's observation that the Bishop of Hippo "is the first Christian thinker whom we can place among the

great philosophers"[14] --- "philosopher" in the customary sense. For Augustine *philosophia* is a rational enterprise; it is Platonism, the Platonism which suggested to him the ideal of *certissima ratione*, a "reason" directed by "faith," to be sure, a "faith" (*fides*) which is also the undeserved gift of God --- *intellectus merces est fidei.*[15]

From Augustine's point of view, truth comes by rational inquiry, but faith shows us where to look and certifies reason's discoveries. Put another way, faith leads to understanding --- *credo ut intelligam.* Thus, Christianity supplies the "faith" and Platonism satisfies the reason.[16]

The confidence which the Bishop of Hippo placed in Plato, Plotinus, Porphyry, Victorinus, etc., was not shared by the Fathers.[17] They had a different conception of Greek philosophy and its value. "The foreign philosophy," as they called it, was only a medium, a means by which to verbalize and communicate the Gospel. It might "decorate the temple of truth," but never was it integrated into the structure. The Fathers may have taken "elements," but never "principles," from Plato, Aristotle, Cicero, Plotinus, etc. Most importantly, they consistently described Christianity as "the true philosophy," "the love of the true wisdom" --- alluding to the fact that Christ is "the Wisdom of God." Naturally, then, monasticism was "the highest philosophy."

Such a mentality seems not to have redounded to Augustine. In point of fact, he is unique, having neither predecessor nor disciples among the Fathers --- not among the Greek or Latin Fathers; nor even St Gregory the Great. Not for centuries will he become theological master of the West.[18] He will have changed

the face of Western Christendom so much that, as Hermann Reuter observed, Augustinianism prepared it for division with the East.[19] In other terms, "insofar as the 'Western' tradition of theology is different from the 'Eastern,'" writes Armstrong, "it is because it is Augustinian rather than because it is temperamentally, racially or geographically 'Western' or Latin or Roman." And he adds that the *sine qua non* of Augustinianism is Neo-Platonism.[20]

The Augustinian synthesis altered the Christianity of the West, a West which had been one spiritual entity with the East; for which reason, incidentally, Fr John Romanides urges us to ignore the usual distinction between "the Greek East and the Latin West," insisting that "the Fathers were neither Latins nor Greeks, but Romans."[21] East and West shared a common tradition --- whatever aspects of that tradition historical and cultural circumstance called upon them to stress --- and Augustine is alien to it.

This book, then, is an examination of the accusation that Augustine of Hippo does indeed stand outside the tradition of the Fathers, outside the Faith of the Catholic Church. I want to look at the evidence the Fathers and the Councils offer, evidence which the Orthodox champions of Augustine have claimed as their own. In the following pages, I want to show what place

he held in the history of the Orthodox Church. I am convinced that behind all his "errors" lurks the ominous shadow of Hellenism. Perhaps this study can contribute the resolution of a matter which has gone for too long unexamined; and which, consequently, has been a source of consternation for many.

Fr Michael Azkoul

Footnotes to the Introduction

1. *The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* (vol. 5), ed. by H.H. Miliman, New York, 1886, p. 391, note 31. Calvin himself wrote, "Augustine is so wholly with me that if I wished to write a confession of faith, I could do so with all fullness and satisfaction out of his writings" (*A Treatise on the Eternal Predestination of God* (pt.I), in *Calvin's Calvinism*, trans. and ed. by H. Cole. London, 1927, p. 38).

2. *On the Councils of the Church*, in Luther's *Works* (vol. 41), ed. by J. Pelikan & H. Lehmann, St. Louis, 1966, p. 27.

3. Thornton, J., "St Augustine and His Enemies," in *The Orthodox Path I*, 3 (1987), 1.

4. Rose, S., "The Place of Blessed Augustine in the Orthodox Church," *The Orthodox Word* XIV, 3 (1978), 138-139. Fr Rose's enconium of Augustine was originally a two part article (March-April and May-June of 1978) for his journal. He later published them in a single book.

   In his review of it, Bishop Chrysostomos of Etna (Calf.), heaps similar abuse upon the anti-Augustine Orthodox. He refers to them as "ultra-conservative factionalists," as "outside the mainstream of Orthodox thought and of careful scholarship." To them, he contrasts Fr Rose who is "the chief advocate of moderation and careful, charitable thinking about the Church and the Fathers."

   In the same book review, Bishop Chrysostomos unintentionally makes the case for the so-called "ultra-conservatives." Augustine's "view of grace was too overstated and not balanced over against the patristic witness as regards the efficacy of human choice and spiritual labor," Chrysostomos writes. "Likewise, as an outgrowth of his

understanding of grace, Augustine developed a theory of predestination that further distorted the Orthodox understanding of free will.

   And, finally, Augustine's *theology* proper, his understanding of God, in its mechanical, overly-logical and rationalistic tone, leads one away from the mystery of God --- which is lost, indeed, in Augustine's failure to capture fully the very mystery of man." Bishop Chrysostomos wants us to believe that Augustine's "understanding of God, despite his overly-logical approach to theology, was derived from a deeply Orthodox encounter with the Trinity" --- a novel idea considering Augustine's cataphaticism, his theory of Ideas and his model of the Trinity (*filioque*).

   Augustine has an Orthodox mind, he continues, despite his "dependence on human logic and philosophical rigor, thus exposing his teaching to later gross distortions, making his small errors great ones" ("The Place of Blessed Augustine in the Orthodox Church. By Seraphim Rose. Introduction by Alexy Young. California: St Herman of Alaska Press, 1982," in *The Greek Orthodox Theological Review* XXVII, 4 (1983), 382-384).

5. *The Unity of the Church and the World Conference of Christian Communities*, trans. by M. Jerenic, Montreal, 1975, p. 31.

6. The first "selected works" of Augustine appeared in Moscow around 1788. In Russia, most of his available works were confined to the Ecclesiastical Academy of Kiev, which was the first Russian school to collect and translate him into the native tongue. By the end of the 19th century, almost all of Augustine's writings had been rendered into Russian, largely the efforts of Professors Athanasy Bulgakov and A.J. Tchekanovsky. They took the Benedictine edition as the basis of their labors (See M. Jugie, *"Saint Augustine dans de littérature théologique de l'Eglise russe,"* in *ECHOS D'ORIENT* XXXII, 160 [1930], 390).

7. St Nikodemos, without careful study of Augustinianism, arbitrarily placed the name of "our holy Father Augustine of Hippo" with a troparion by Michael Kritoboulos into his

Synaxaristes for 15 June (t. 1 [Sept.-Feb.]. Athens, 1868, 206-207). He alludes to the favorable testimonies of St Gennadios Scholarios; and to the belief of Patriarch Dositheos of Jerusalem that Augustine's works had been corrupted (ἐνοθεύθησαν).

Nikodemos knew that Maximos Planoudes translated *De Trinitate* into Greek, but says nothing about having read it. He also failed to mention the controversies in which Augustine was involved. Interestingly, in his compilation of the canons (*The Pedalion*), Nikodemos mentions Pelagius and Donatus but not Augustine, very strange considering the essential role played by the Bishop of Hippo in these disputes. See the commentary on Canons CXXI-CXXIX of Carthage (418?), pages 688-699 of the D. Cummings translation (Chicago, 1957).

8. "St Augustine and His Enemies," *loc.cit.*

9. "The Place of Blessed Augustine....," 136-140.

10. Ranson, P., *Le Lourd Sommeil Dogmatique de l'Occident*, Paris, n.d., 1.

11. Etienne Gilson asserts that the negative theology of Plotinus constituted for Augustine a "devaluation of being"; it is here, philosophically, that he parts company with Plotinus and Victorinus (*Being and Some Philosophers*, Toronto, 1957, p. 31). But negative theology is historically the theology of the Fathers. They distinguish it from the "divine economy" by which the Trinity, in relation to the creature, consorts to restore man and nature to fellowship with Himself.

12. Volume I. Paris, 1909, 2268-2472.

13. Gilson maintains "that practically every Christian philosophy makes room for the Platonic doctrine of Ideas; only since the Christian God is being, Plato's Ideas must become the divine Ideas. So much so that rather than indwelling God, they are God. To quote but a few great names, St Augustine, St Anselm, St Bonaventura and St Thomas Aquinas all agree on this fundamental point" (*The Christian Philosophy of St Augustine*, trans. by L.E.M. Lynch, New York, 1960, p. 57).

14. "St Augustine and the Eastern Tradition," *Eastern Churches Quarterly* V, 7-8 (1943), 161. Adolf von Harnack says that Augustine deserves to be called a "philosopher" because he "brought to an end the development of ancient philosophy by completing the process" and "making the inner life of man the starting point of reflection on the world" (*The History of Dogma* [vol. 5], trans. by J. Miller. London, 1898, p. 107). Also, Augustine's version of Socrates' "know thyself" is pertinent here: the "image of God" in man is the analogy of the divine Intellect, so to know oneself is to know God (*De Trin.* X, iv, 6 PL 42 976-977).

15. *In Joan. Evang.* XXIX, 6 PL 35 1630.

16. Of course, Augustine did not believe that every aspect of Christianity (e.g., the Incarnation) could be demonstrated by reason; nevertheless, Platonism was the handmaid of the Church, helping her "to realize [her] own internal structure and to develop [her] theology," writes Henri Marrou. "In this atmosphere, it was quite natural to pass from the *Enneads* to the Prologue of St John's Gospel, or to Paul" (*St Augustine and His Influence Through the Ages*, trans. by P. Hepburne-Scott & E. Hill, New York, 1962, p. 28).

17. The question "Who and what is a Father?" will be discussed later. In any case, the Church does not permit secular historians to determine her choice of spokesmen.

18. See J.M. Wallace-Hadrill, *The Frankish Church*. Oxford, 1983; and H. Leibschuetz, "Development of Thought in the Carolingian Empire," in *The Cambridge History of Later Greek and Early Medieval Philosophy*, ed. by A.H. Armstrong. Cambridge (Eng.), 1967, pp. 571-586.

19. *"Augustin hat die Trennung des Occidents und des Orients verbereits, eine bahnbrechende Wirkung und den ersteren augeuebt"* (*Augustinische Studien*, Gotha, 1887, s. 229). B.B. Warfield agrees, saying, "But it was Augustine who imprinted upon

the Western section of the Church a character so specific as naturally to bring the separation of the Church in its train." (*Calvin and Augustine*, Philadelphia, 1956, p. 307).

20. "St Augustine and the Eastern Tradition," 161, 167. In the East, says Fr Romanides, "Augustine was simply ignored" ("The Filioque," in *The Meeting of the Sub-Commission of Orthodox and Anglicans at St Albans*. July 21-28, 1975, p. 288).

21. "The Filioque," p. 287.

Chapter I

Augustine and His Influence

Augustine is the source of constant fascination for historians, theologians and philosophers. Books and articles about him continue to flow from their pens. Thus, one more biography and survey of his influence would appear to be superfluous --- save from a new perspective, that is to say, as a traditional Orthodox Christian looks at him. The chief sources of Augustine's life are his *Confessions*, his letters and the biography by his friend, Possidius, Bishop of Calama. From these come the personal details of his boyhood, his education, his career, the motivation for his literary endeavors. Concerning the other, the extent of his influence, we naturally turn to church history.

1. The Life and Times of Augustine

Augustine was born 13 November 354 at Tagaste (modern Souk-Ahras, Algeria) in North Africa, the Roman

province of Numidia. Aurelius, his praenomen, was given to him by his contemporaries. His family was not wealthy, but his father, Patricius (d. 371), a Roman administrator, provided well for his family. Augustine's mother, St Monica, was a Christian woman of intense piety. She nurtured her three children (Augustinus, Navigius and Perpetua) with the greatest care. She prayed constantly for the conversion of her pagan husband and family.

Thus, Monica tried to instruct Augustine in the Faith of Jesus Christ. She made certain that he became a catechumen; but he resisted Baptism until struck one day with a serious illness. When the danger passed, the rite was deferred, despite his mother's admonition. Portalié thinks that Augustine refused the Sacrament, not from any lack of faith necessarily, but in keeping with "the deplorable custom of the time" of waiting until the deathbed.[1]

Augustine received a Christian education. Also, his father, noticing his early promise as a student, directed the young Augustine towards a legal career (rhetorician) and spared no expense for his training. The boy studied in his native town and later at Madaura. Patricius eventually sent him to Carthage (370) where, aside from reading the Latin poets, Augustine became involved with a woman who gave him a son, Adeodatus (who died at a young age). He did not separate from the woman for fifteen years.

His Carthage experience was important, especially the discovery of Cicero's *Hortensius*, which brought the young man to a moral crisis. "Suddenly, every vain hope became worthless to me and I yearned with an incredible ardor of heart for the immortality of wisdom," he wrote. From that moment, he lost all

interest in rhetoric (except as a means of livelihood) and surrendered himself to the quest for "wisdom."[2]

He would not really come to understand the path he had chosen until he had endured years of intellectual frustration. Augustine admitted that he had, at that time, not come to a personal sense of sin, not even when he joined the religion of Mani. That religion gave him only an awareness of evil in things, in something other than himself. For him, Mani, the high-born Persian prophet form Ecbatana, had solved the mysteries of the universe. Matter is evil, Manicheism taught him, spirit good.[3] Augustine seemed to have accepted the Manichean claim that its leader had received revelations from God, the God of Light, not the Principle of Darkness.

Augustine threw himself into this religion with uncompromising zeal. He read all its books, defended its teachings and attacked the Catholic Faith with callous vehemence. He drew his friend, Alypius, into the same error, and several others also. He journeyed to Tagaste to teach grammar, but the death of a close friend made his residence there intolerable. He returned to Carthage where he resumed lecturing in rhetoric and where he wrote his first work (no longer extant), entitled *De Pulchro et apto* (On the Beautiful and Fitting).[4]

Perhaps the subject of this treatise led him to question the Manicheans appeal to magic, leaving Augustine uneasy about his religious affiliation. He became increasingly uncomfortable with its advocacy of astrology which blamed the stars for human misery and imperfection. He noticed, too, that when the Scriptures conflicted with the doctrine of Mani, their priests would declare, "They have falsified the text."[5]

His brethren, concerned about his petulance, recommended he speak with Faustus of Milevis, the famous Manichean bishop who would soon come to Carthage. When he arrived, Augustine conversed with him, leaving the discussion with the impression that Faustus was a popular orator, not a man of learning. The scales had fallen from his eyes.

Augustine then turned all his energies to the classical philosophy of the Greeks. He departed for Rome in 383 to that very purpose, his mother following secretly. He disliked the atmosphere of the capital and applied for a vacant professorship at Milan, receiving the approval of Symmachus, the Roman prefect. Augustine knew, too, that St Ambrose was bishop of the city. He visited him and was captivated by the hierarch's charm and piety. Thus, he attended the Liturgy when the Saint celebrated, anxious to hear his Ciceronian eloquence. Augustine's mind was not yet settled. He turned to the Academics for succour, all the while struggling to shed the Manicheism he now thoroughly disdained. As many historians have observed, he never fully rid himself of its influence.

Yet, the philosophy of the Academics was also to fail him. As he wrote in the *Confessions*, "I was in doubt about all things and took no position on anything, but I decided nevertheless to abandon the Manicheans."[6] He wanted the rational clarity and certainty about which Cicero had spoken, a need that would never forsake him.

Providence, Augustine believed, led him from the "barren scepticism" of the Academics to the "mystic vision" of the Platonists. Plato and his school gave him an understanding of spiritual being. "Now when he meditated upon the profound theories about the

'unchangeable light' of truth, about evil, which is essentially privation, about God, an immaterial and infinite Being Who is the source of all beings," Portalié explains, "and about the Word Itself, which he thought he found in these works, Augustine was carried out of himself and seized by a new passion, a passion for [Platonic] philosophy."[7]

After reading Marius Victorinus, the Neo-Platonist who had converted to Christianity and who translated the *Enneads* into Latin, Augustine undertook to find the dimensions of his new commitment. At the same time, he sensed within himself a genuine interest in the Catholic Faith.[8] After a talk with Simplicianus, St Ambrose's successor at Milan, he was ready to devote himself to the Saviour.

There remained, however, the great obstacle to his conversion --- sensuality. In the summer of 386, he received a visit from a friend, a certain Pontitian, just recently returned from Egypt. He told Augustine of St Anthony and the remarkable ascetics of the Egyptian Thebaid. Augustine was shaken to the core, rushed from his house into the garden where he flung himself beneath a fig tree, bursting into tears and prayer. He recorded in the *Confessions* that he heard a voice say, "Take up and read!" He fumbled for the volume next to his friend, Alypius, and opened to St Paul's Epistle to the Romans --- "Not in rioting and drunkenness, not in chambering and in wantonness, not in strife and envying, but put on the Lord Jesus Christ and make no provision to gratify the lusts of the flesh" (Rom. 13:13-14). He read no further. "As I finished the sentence," Augustine recounts, "as though the light of peace had poured into my heart, all the shadows of doubt dispersed. Thus hast Thou converted

me to Thee, so as no longer to seek for either wife or other hope of the world, standing fast in the true Faith Thou so many years ago revealed to my mother."[9]

Very shortly after this episode, Augustine withdrew with several companions to Cassisiacum (near Milan), to the country estate of a friend. Once there he announced to the local bishop that he was a candidate for Baptism, much to the joy of his mother, who had since come to Milan. He was received into the Church on the following Pascha (387), along with his son and his friend, Alypius. Satisfied that Augustine had fulfilled her most earnest desire, Monica made preparation to return to Tagaste. The holy woman died at Ostia, just as she was ready to board the ship that would take her home. She made a last request of her son, "Bury my body anywhere and trouble not yourself, save that you remember me at the altar whenever you may."

Augustine had planned to return with her, but on her repose, he decided to remain in Italy and throw himself into the struggle against the Manicheans. He had, of course, already distinguished himself as an author, having composed while at Cassisiacum, *Contra Academicos*, against scepticism; *De Vita beata*, on the blessed life; *De ordine*, on the significance of evil; and *Soliloquia*, on the elucidation of spiritual truth.

Shortly before his Baptism, Augustine wrote *De immortalitate animae*, on the immortality of the soul, inspired not so much by the Christian Faith as by Platonism. Later, while in Rome, he composed *De quantitate animae* and *De magistro*, on the nature of the soul and its teacher. The reckoning with the Manicheans involved the writing of two books, *De moribus ecclesiae Catholicae* and *De moribus*

Manichaeorum libri duo, on the morals of the Catholic Church and the Manichean sect.

Against the latter, he also addressed a cosmogony, *De Genesi contra Manichaeos;* and *De duabus animbus contra Manichaeos*, on the nature of the soul; and finally against his old antagonist, Faustus of Milevis, *Contra Faustus Manichaeum* (400). In this, his first great controversy, Augustine took positions he would eventually change. For example, in his reply to the Manicheans, he defended the power of the human volition to choose between good and evil. He agreed, too, that those who choose wrongly will be punished by God. Augustine made no mention of "original sin," the theory that will become the hallmark of his later writings. Thus, he argued,

> I say it is not sin if not committed by my own will, even as there is reward for doing right. In other words, if one sins willingly, he deserves to be punished, even as he who freely does good deserves to be rewarded. But who doubts that one is rewarded when he acts from a good will? And also, that punishment is inflicted upon him who acts from an evil will?[10]

He added in the same treatise,

> Therefore, so long as we bear the image of the earthly man [Adam], that is, so long as we live according to the flesh --- which is also called the 'old man' --- we have the necessary habit which blocks our wish to do what we want...the law of sin is that by which the sinner dies, a

law from which we are liberated only when we have begun to be righteous...[11]

Augustine declared that the grace of God gives us freedom from "the law of sin and death" (Rom. 8:2) without saying a word about inherited guilt or irresistible grace.[12]

While disputing with the Manicheans, Augustine also undertook to combat the Donatists, the sectarians he first encountered on his return to Tagaste in 388. Donatism originated at the time of the Diocletian persecutions nearly a century before. The sect was formed by Christians who had deeply resented the appointment of a bishop whose consecration had been performed by *traditores*, that is, those who "handed over" the holy Scriptures to the Roman authorities in order to avoid torture or death. Therefore, the party established its own episcopacy whose most famous representative was Donatus (315), for whom the schism was named.

Augustine, profoundly disturbed by the pretensions of the Donatists, launched a series of literary attacks against them, many of which have survived. He wrote *Pslamus contra partem Donati*, *De baptismo contra Donatistas* in seven books and *Contra litteras Petiliani Donatistae* in three books. In these and other works, Augustine expounded his notions of Baptism and Ordination (and by implication, the Eucharist) outside the Church, opinions which brought him into sharp conflict with the Orthodox Faith.

He claimed to have extended the mystagogy of St Cyprian of Carthage, a contention he failed to prove by anything he wrote. Augustine made other interesting ecclesiological statements during the Donatist

controversy. For the first time, too, appeared his peculiar exegesis of Romans 5:12 (see Chapter IV), an attempt undoubtedly to foil the arrogance of the Donatists.[13] Also, he gave special attention to the fact of the Church's geographic universality, a fact which lent new emphasis to the word "catholic" --- commonly understood qualitatively as "integrality" or "completeness" or "perfection." The Church, he reminded the Donatists, is "catholic" and not limited to their corner of Africa.

In fact, he continued, the Church on earth is not even restricted to her visible unity. He opined that "some who have been baptized outside the Church may be considered to have been baptized within" while "some who seemed to have been baptized within may be understood, through the same foreknowledge of God, more truly to have been baptized outside of her..."[14] He rejected the Donatist opinion that the piety of the clergyman is a condition for the "validity" of the holy Mysteries. His remarks bore the ring of irony, for Augustine owed much to a Donatist theologian, Tychonius, who elaborated a similar ecclesiology in his *Commentary on the Apocalypse*, that is, a doctrine of the "mixed nature" of the Church.

Tychonius's *Rules* were likewise valuable to Augustine, teaching him that the truth in history lies neither in events nor in the actions of men, but in the hidden drama of sin and redemption. It was perhaps such ideas which explain Augustine's failure to succinctly identify the visible and the sacerdotal Church with the true Church, a failure that would have historical consequences he could not have foreseen.

The Donatists proved formidable adversaries. They rightly observed that the Mysteries or Sacraments

belonged only to the historical Church, the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church, the Church ordained by Christ and established by Him on "the foundation of the Prophets and the Apostles." Therefore, they denied mystagogical grace to heretics, because the latter were visibly outside the Church.

The Donatists also held a view different from Augustine on the relationship between the Church and the Empire. He maintained that the Christian *imperium* had the right to extinguish the blight of schism; they did not. During this controversy, Augustine became a priest (391). Four years later, he was elevated to the Orthodox episcopate. All the while, he continued to write against the Donatists and the Manicheans, producing two of his most popular works, *De utilitate credendi* and *De diversis questionibus VII ad Simplicianum.*

Between 397 and 401, he published *De doctrina christiana*, *De catechizandis rudibus*, and his monumental *Confessions*. He began in the year 400 perhaps the most important book of his long and illustrious career, *De Trinitate*, which he did not complete until 416, during the Pelagian quarrel. He was also part of the ecclesiastical effort to settle the Donatist schism: the Carthaginian Councils of 404, 405, 407 and 411.

During this time, Pelagius (360-c. 420), the Briton, arrived in Rome. His brief commentaries on the epistles of St Paul stirred the theological waters. These writings, long preserved among the works of St Jerome, became a source of division in the Roman Christian community, especially after Pelagius converted the patrician, Coelestius, son of a distinguished Roman family.[15] In the year 411, they

fled to Africa in order to escape the rule of Alaric and his Goths who, the year before, had sacked the city of Rome. They passed through Hippo to visit Augustine, but he was not available, still preoccupied with the Donatist schism. Pelagius wrote him a courteous letter and Augustine replied in kind. The heresiarch left for Palestine, but Coelestius remained in North Africa and applied for ordination to the presbytery. Naturally, his faith was examined and his opinions aroused suspicion. Deacon Paulinus of Milan, freshly arrived from Italy, warned the president of the local synod, Aurelius of Carthage, that his new candidate for the priesthood espoused false doctrine. A council was held at Carthage (412) and Pelagianism was condemned.

With his master, Coelestius had taught that Adam was created wholly mortal and would have died even without the Fall; Adam's sin affected only himself; the new-born are in the same condition as Adam before his transgression; the human race neither dies because of Adam's sin nor rises because of Christ's resurrection; unbaptized children are saved; and the Law, as well as the Gospel, leads to salvation. In other words, Pelagianism was a revival of pagan secularism and autosoterism.

Although Augustine had not taken part in the proceedings, he concurred with the decision of the African council. He was also induced to write against Pelagianism, especially after hearing that the heresy was spreading. News came to him that people in southern Italy and Sicily were infected with the error. His *De peccatorum meritis et remissione et de baptismo parvulorum* was the first salvo in a barrage against the Pelagians. This book also provided the first exposition of the great theological themes connected

with his name, in particular "original sin." In the same year (412), he wrote *De spiritu et littera*; and two years later, *Epistola CLVII ad Hilarium de Pelagianismo*. They were followed in 415 with *De natura et gratia contra Pelagius*.

On learning of the furor caused by Pelagius' letter to the virgin, Demetria; and the decisions of the two Palestinian synods in favor of the Briton, Augustine sent *De gestis Pelagii* (417) along with several letters to the confused St Paulinus of Nola who had not only admitted Pelagians to his library but to Holy Communion. Augustine probably obtained knowledge of the Eastern synods from his disciple, Paulus Orosius, who attended with St Jerome. It was also probably Orosius who informed the Greek bishops about Pelagianism and Augustine's opposition to it. But the fame of his mentor had not yet reached the East and Pelagius may well have disclosed that the Bishop of Hippo had, at one time, "implicated himself with the faction of Rufinus," the student of Origen.[16] In addition, the heresiarch used the language barrier to his advantage.

John of Jerusalem, president of the first synod, laid the issue before Pope Innocent I, since both parties in the dispute fell under his jurisdiction. Also, in December of 415, a second Palestinian council or synod was held at Diosopolis (Lydda), under Eulogios of Caesarea, to hear the complaints of two bishops banished from Gaul. They, with Jerome, raised the charge of heresy against Pelagius. But "this miserable synod," as Saint Jerome called it, exonerated him, having no more understanding of Pelagius' doctrine than its predecessor.

Nevertheless, the liaison between Pelagianism,

Origenism and Nestorianism brought the condemnation of the new heresy at the Ecumenical Council of Ephesos (431). In North Africa, too, the Councils of Carthage and Milevis (416) execrated Pelagianism. Pope Innocent confirmed their decision while making no statement about the results of the Palestinian assemblies. His successor, Pope Zosimus, a man of Greek extraction, did not agree with Innocent and issued in 417 an encyclical critical of the African councils. He may have been influenced by Coelestius, who had recently returned to Rome from Constantinople with an ambiguous *libellus fidei*.

The following year, Bishop Aurelius convoked another council at Carthage which protested the papal censure and promulgated eight canons of its own. Moreover, the Africans succeeded in procuring from the Western Emperor, Honorius (395-423), several edicts against the Pelagians. At Rome, Zosimus, having finally seen through the trickery of Coelestius, anathematized both him and his master. In the summer of 418, he issued his famous *Epistola Tractoria*, of which only a portion remains:

> We have decreed the judgment passed upon Pelagius and Coelestius by Pope Innocent from the See of St Peter shall stand until they openly profess that the grace of God given us through our Lord Jesus Christ helps us in every action, not only to know but to do what is right (*donec appertissima confessione fateantur, gratia Dei per Jesum Christum nostrum, non solum ad cognoscendum, verum etiam ad faciendum justitiam*). Without that grace we are unable to obtain or to think or to say or

> perform anything that is holy and salutary...we know this to signify that you [African bishops] hold the naked sword of truth, so to speak, which quickly struck down those men that exalt the free will of man to the detriment of God's grace... And, so, we are convinced that our free wills are not set aside, and yet we have no doubt that in all good actions of the human will, His grace is the more powerful agent (*ut nec nostrum sentiamus de esse arbitru, et in bonis quisbusque voluntatis humanae singulis motibus magis illius valdere non dubitemus auxillium*).[17]

The encyclical of Zosimus, signed by his bishops and ratified by imperial decree, was the death knell for Pelagianism. With full confidence, Augustine produced *De gratia Christi et peccato originali* (418), *De nuptiis et concupiscentia* (419-420), and *De anima et eius origine* (420).

Yet, Pelagianism would not die. Augustine was confronted by a new and far more sophisticated adversary in Julian of Eclanum (Apulia). He, spokesman for seventeen other Italian bishops, protested to Zosimus against the repudiation of the Pelagian doctrine. The response of the Pope was the deposition of him and his colleagues; and of the Emperor, banishment from Italy. Julian, nevertheless, continued to write, reserving special venom for Augustine, whom he described as "a Manichean and a leader of traducianists."

Augustine answered with *Contra Julianum haeresis Pelaginae defensorem* (421), *Enchirdion* (421) and several letters. Aside from these polemics, he wrote

De gratia et libero arbitrio ad Valentinum (426-427) and completed his *De civitas Dei*, the historiosophy that will have so much influence in the medieval and modern West, the book which historians generally identify with the Christian view of history. *The City of God* is more than a theodicy; it is also a summary of his theological opinions.

Some of those opinions were a source of consternation to many in Africa, particularly the teaching that grace alone accounts for the good in the human nature. The monks at the monastery of Hadrumentum understood his charitology to mean the abolition of free will. Augustine hoped to calm their fears with *De gratia et libero arbitrio* and *De correptione et gratia* (426-427). They seemed to have been assuaged, but *On Rebuke and Grace* caused a storm among the ascetics of Gaul, especially at Marseilles where St John Cassian, the disciple of St John Chrysostom, took up the pen against Augustine's monergism and theory of predestination.[18]

We do not know whether the criticism of his doctrine led Augustine to write *Retractiones* (426-427), but it is certain that he made very few revisions. His most radically predestinarian treatises, *De praedestinatio sanctio ad Prosperum et Hilarium* and his *De dona perseverantiae ad eosdem* were in fact written (428-429) after the *Retractiones*. He reaffirmed, in the strongest terms, his belief in predestination to salvation and damnation ("double predestination") as well as the irresistibility of grace.

In his last years, Augustine ventured to refute the Arian heresy which had become the religion of the Goths and Vandals now overrunning Western Europe. Also, he continued the battle with Julian of Eclanum.

He wrote numerous letters and commentaries on the Psalms (*Enarrationes in Psalmos*). Thanks to the efforts of another disciple, Mercurius Mercator, in Constantinople, Augustine was invited to the Ecumenical Council to be held in Ephesos. He became ill and, after three months, on 28 August 430, he passed to his reward, the Vandals at the very gates of Hippo.

His biographer, Possidius, records Augustine's last hours. About the learned bishop, he wrote, "It is surely clear in his writings that this priest, so dear and acceptable to God, lived uprightly and wisely in the faith, hope and charity of the Catholic Church, as far as he could see the light of truth."[19] The body of Augustine was laid to rest with honor in the Basilica of St Stephen and later (486) transferred by Fulgentius, Bishop of Ruspe to Sardinia. Two centuries passed before his remains were taken, on the heels of the Saracen conquest of the island, to mainland Italy. Some questions persist about the place of his final rest in a marble sarcophagus at the Pavian church of San Pietro.

2. The Authority of Augustine in the West

The high esteem in which Augustine was held in the West had been tarnished by the Pelagian controversy. The monks of Gaul had read his anti-Manichean writings --- and others no doubt --- with great pleasure. Until those fateful days of the struggle with Pelagius *cum sui*, St Paulinus of Nola more than admired him. Likewise, in the fashionable rhetoric of those times, Pope Celestine, in his eulogy,[20] as did several papal

predecessors, praised the Bishop of Hippo as a man of great learning and a doctor of the Faith.

In the eyes of most, however, Augustine still lived in the shadow of the Fathers. St Jerome did not mention him in *De viris illustribus*. St Gennadius of Marseilles, in his book with the same title, although applauding Augustine's spirituality, showed little knowledge of what he had written. In his life of St Martin of Tours, Sulpicius Severus ignored Augustine altogether while he displayed ardent appreciation for the life and works of Sts Cyprian, Ambrose, Jerome, Paulinus and John Cassian. Neither did Sts Nicetas of Remesiana, Valerian of Cimiez, Peter Chrysologus of Ravenna, show the slightest influence of Augustinianism in their teachings.[21]

Likewise, St Pope Leo the Great was no Augustinian;[22] and St Gregory the Great, although his writings borrowed language and concepts from his works, was no advocate of those views which put the African's Orthodoxy in doubt. We cannot say with certainty which of Augustine's writings were read by St Benedict of Nursia (Norcia); his *Rule* revealed no knowledge of the theology peculiar to the Augustinian tradition.[23] And, of course, one would not expect the "semi-Pelagian," St Gregory of Tours (538-594), to find Augustine's ideas attractive.

Interesting, too, is the case of the Roman Popes. While claiming pride in Augustine's achievements, yet they made little effort to study his works. Very often, too, they were trapped between him and his opponents, opponents whom the Popes recognized as holy, honorable and learned men. They heard the objections to the doctrine of Augustine, but it appears they cared more for peace than truth. The list of his opponents

was formidable: along with St John Cassian, Sts Vincent of Lerins,[24] Hilary of Arles, Honoratus and Gennadius of Marseilles, Faustus of Riez (the teacher of Sts Lupus of Troyes and Patrick of Ireland), we may count Arnobius the Younger and the author of *Predestinatus*.[25]

Prosper of Aquitaine (390-463) described Augustine's adversaries as "the remnants of the Pelagian heresy" --- *pelaginae pravitatis reliquiae*; and someone in the 16th century will call them "semi-Pelagians."[26] Prosper resented the "veiled calumnies" against his master, the attacks on his theology despite the Pope's command to end all polemics against Augustine.[27]

a. Augustine's most powerful contemporary adversary was St John Cassian (360-435) of St Victor, who had been ordained a deacon by St John Chrysostom whose name he took. Cassian, like many others, had initially approved Augustine's defense of Christianity, his advocacy of free will. John's *De Institutione Coenoborium*, on the monastic life, written at the behest of Bishop Castor of Apt, had implicitly the same purpose.

Thus, he was appalled when Augustine, during the Pelagian controversy, took a new way. In his *Collationes Patrum*, Cassian, although not mentioning Augustine by name, accused him of parting company with the Catholic Fathers who, unlike the Bishop of Hippo, directed their energies to "the perfection of the heart" and avoided "inane and verbose disputation" --- *omnibus catholicis Patribus definitur, qui perfectionem cordis, non inani disputatione verborum.*[28]

Cassian and the *Massilienses* maintained that Augustine, in his elaboration of the doctrines of grace

and salvation, taught new and dangerous opinions unknown to the Fathers and at variance with accepted interpretation of the Scriptures. They rightly argued that all the Fathers were "semi-Pelagian," that is, all taught the cooperation of the human will with grace (synergism) in the process of perfection and salvation.[29]

Cassian recognized, too, that Augustine's imaginative theories of grace and predestination,[30] not unlike the heresy of Pelagius, involved the greater error of "transposing grace and liberty, realities of the spiritual order, to the rational plane, where," according to Vladimir Lossky, "grace and liberty are transformed into two mutually exclusive concepts which then need to be reconciled, as if they were two objects exterior to one another."[31] But on that plane, no resolution of the conflict between the Augustinians and the Pelagians was possible.

Moreover, the antagonists were both *monergists*, that is, they taught salvation was achieved by a single will or power: for Augustine the divine Will alone saved us, for Pelagius only the human will was required to gain eternal life. However, traditional synergy, patterned after the human and Divine in Christ, required the involvement of both grace and free will, whatever the eminence of the first.[32] It is not surprising that in the heat of argument --- between the rationalisms of Augustine and Pelagius --- that St John Cassian was not heard. His insistence upon the essential role of a free (but enervated) human will acting in conjunction with a necessary (but resistible) grace in the theandric process of salvation was, unfortunately, misconstrued by many then, as it is now, as an attempt to mediate opposing positions.

In truth, St John Cassian and those with him represented the universal Tradition of the Catholic Church. He stood, therefore, above the fray, seeking desperately to interject the imperatives of that Tradition into the debate. The fact that he may have been trained in the Christian *askesis* in Egypt and at the knee of St John Chrysostom is no reason to assume that he hoped to impose an "Eastern solution" on the affair, as if the Church had more than one dogmatic Tradition.[33] St John was convinced that both Augustine and Pelagius had "audaciously" passed beyond the limits established by divine revelation.[34]

b. After the time of Cassian the Roman, there is no more vigorous opponent of Augustine than St Faustus of Riez or Rhegium (d. 485). Faustus seems to have studied his anti-Pelagian writings carefully, even twice quoting from *De gratia et libero Arbitrio* in his *De Gratia Libri Duo*, produced at the request of Bishop Leontius of Arles. To the monk Graecus, Faustus wrote that Augustine had been suspected of heresy in some things, *viz.*, grace and predestination.[35] Their theology, revived in his time by Lucidus, the Saint described as a "lie," "blasphemous" and "obnoxious."[36] He knew, too, that his refutation of it would fall ultimately on Augustine.[37]

The vigorous opposition of St Faustus to the predestination of Lucidus was in large part responsible for the local Council of Arles (475) --- which in its prologue, addressed to the local archbishop, Leo of Arles, declared *in condemnando praedestinationis errors*[38] --- and the Council of Lyons several years later (480) said little else. In accord with these assemblies, Faustus composed his major works against the autosoterism of Pelagius and the predestinationism

of Augustine. Those who ascribe salvation entirely to the free will of man or to irresistible grace, said Faustus, fall into heathen folly. He preached the doctrine of *meritum de congruo et condigno*, that is, grace is commonly imparted but not imposed. He also took predestination to be a parody of the pagan notion of fate. Thus, he wrote to Lucidus,

> We, however, maintain that whosoever is lost is lost by his own fault; yet, he could have obtained salvation through grace if he had cooperated with it; and, on the other hand, whosoever through grace attains, by means of cooperation, to perfection, might nevertheless through his own fault, his own negligence, fall and be lost. We exclude, of course, all personal pride, since we insist that all we possess has been gratuitously received from the Hand of God.[39]

Under Faustus' leadership, the Council of Arles condemned the heresy of predestination. Later, "because new errors had arisen," another council was convened in the city of Lyons. Its Archbishop, "the holy Patiens," laid before his colleagues, *De ecclesiasticis dogmatibus*, a book originally thought to have been the work of St Gennadius of Marseilles. C.J. Hefele describes the treatise as presenting the "semi-Pelagian" point of view, illustrating that "the dominating intellect of Faustus prevailed no less at the Synod of Lyons than at the Synod of Arles."[40]

c. Despite these episcopal gatherings, the Western churches remained divided over the rival perspectives. So persistent was "the party of Faustus"

that Pope Gelasius I, in his letter to the bishops of Picenum (1 November 493), commanded that the attacks against Augustine, *ecclesiasticorum lumina magistorum*, and St Jerome, *beatae memoriae Hieronymum*, cease.[41] Gelasius did not repudiate the teachings of Faustus, but upheld the Orthodoxy of Jerome and Augustine, whom he further praised as "those two luminaries of the Church."

The result of the papal decree was only to muffle the angry voices, a silence which had only a short duration. During the pontificate of Pope Hormisdas (514-523), Possessor, an African prelate, communicated to Rome his misgivings concerning the "Pelagianism" of St Faustus. The Pope replied that Faustus was not the official spokesman of the Church and that Possessor ought always defer to the teachings of *beati Augustini* whose works are "summarized in chapters and preserved in the archives of the Roman Church." Nevertheless, he "will know clearly what he must hold if he carefully studies the words of the Apostle Paul."[42]

Portalié observes that the Pope informed Bishop Possessor that Christian truth cannot be decided wholly on the opinions of "St Augustine;" nor is it sufficient to consult his writings alone. Therefore, if Hormisdas urged Possessor to read Augustine, in particular *On the Predestination of the Saints* and *On the Gift of Perseverance*, his advice was not given as an endorsement of Augustinianism, but, more precisely, "in order to establish the absolute gratuity of grace against the Semi-Pelagians."[43]

The troubles of Hormisdas were not over. To Rome came the "vexatious" Scythian monks, led by John Maxentios.[44] They were, among many other things, followers of Augustine and enemies of St Faustus. In

their *confessio fidei* presented to the Pope, the Scythians characterized the doctrine of Faustus as "contrary to the tradition of the Fathers" and "of the Apostle himself." They urged Hormisdas to condemn him along with the Nestorians and the Pelagians. Not only did the Pope not comply with their demands, but told them that he would remit their case to Constantinople under whose jurisdiction Scythia (lower Danube) fell.

Furthermore, although having given his approval to the teachings of Augustine and Prosper, he portrayed St Faustus as "holding opinions which disquiet no one." Writing to the Patriarch of Constantinople, the Pope excoriated the Scythians as "vile disturbers of Orthodoxy." They balked at his response and appealed to Fulgentius of Ruspe (468-533) and a group of African bishops exiled to Sardinia by the Vandals.[45]

Fulgentius replied with his *Contra Faustum* in seven books (lost) and later in three books, *De Veritate Praedestinationis et Gratia Dei*; and, finally, with the other bishops, the *Epistola Synodica XV*, all directed against the so-called semi-Pelagians and which, consequently, denounced "the opinions of Faustus" as "inventions, opposed to the truth and wholly inimical to the Catholic Faith" --- *commenta, veritati contraria, catholicae fidei penitus inimica.*

Meanwhile, the Scythians had departed Rome for the East. They journeyed to the imperial capital, as they said, to answer the call of the Emperor Justin (518-527) for a christological formula which would end the strife between the Orthodox and the Monophysites. John Maxentios claimed to have found the perfect compromise: the unity of the two natures in Christ so intimate that on the Cross the divine Nature suffered not only in the flesh but *through* the flesh. The

Scythian proposal captured the imagination of the emperor's nephew, Justinian, future ruler of the Christian Roman Empire. After his ascent to the throne in 527, he temporarily endorsed Scythian theopaschism.

Not so incidentally, the Scythians promoted Augustinianism, not without some influence on the Emperor Justinian. He understood, too, the value of "blessed Augustine" and "the other Western Fathers" for his *renovatio imperii*. In his letters to the fifth Ecumenical Council, held at the Trullo (553), he would cite Augustine several times, both to religious and political purpose. Whatever his knowledge of Augustine --- and he did read Latin --- and of his true convictions about the Bishop of Hippo, Justinian's letters and discourses do not tell us.

c. In Gaul, the Council of Orange (529) was convoked to hear the complaints of the Scythians and Fulgentians. This gathering, under the leadership of the Augustinian, Caesarius of Arles (470-543), did not approve *in toto* the teachings of his master. But, also, we are not certain what information the Council possessed concerning those teachings. Caesarius sought the aid of Pope Felix IV, requesting from him whatever Augustinian literature was stored in the papal archives. Felix sent a number of *capitulae*, "some more, some less, literally from the writings of Augustine (and Prosper); but which were nonetheless characterized by Orange in its *praefatio* as propositions of the *antiquii patres*, for, as the assembled bishops believed, St Leo the Great, Gelasius, Prosper of Aquitaine and others had put forth the same statements and propositions as Augustine, often with literal uniformity."[46]

But there is some question about the *capitulae*.

No such "literal uniformity" exists between the "statements and propositions" of Augustine and the Fathers. Consequently, in his account of the Council, Deacon Cyprian notes that the dubious nature of the evidence impelled "the bishops beyond Isere to assemble at Valence" in 530.[47] There the Bishop of Toulon cited verses from the Scriptures and the Fathers in support of *gratia praeveniens* which led Pope Boniface II to reject the arguments of Caesarius's opponents. Yet, in its decisions this Council of Valence, not unlike Orange, rejected *praedestinatio ad malum* and was silent on *gratia irresistibilis*.

d. Near the end of the 6th century, the most remarkable man in the history of the Byzantine papacy became Bishop of Rome, Saint Gregory the Great (540-604), called "the Dialogist" by the East for his *Dialogues*, his only work translated into Greek. Historians ordinarily place Gregory in the Augustinian camp, as if his teachings were wholly dependent upon the theology of "the blessed Augustine," as the Saint referred to him in a letter to George the Presbyter (*Ep.* 15; bk. VII). But, not without importance is his allusion to John Cassian as "saint" in another letter to the Abbess Respecta of Marseilles (*Ep.* 12; bk. VII).

Uncertain how to classify Gregory's doctrine, Harnack uses the curious phrase "emasculated Augustinianism"[48] to characterize it. Albeit the Saint adapted some of Augustine's ideas, evidence banishes the usual stereotype. Let us concede that Gregory wanted to employ Augustinian terminology to express Christian truth, yet, as more than one commentator has observed, with this endeavor the theology of the Dialogist becomes unclear, sometimes confused. The confusion and lack of clarity is entirely predictable.

St Gregory did not really understand Augustine's theology nor its implication. St Gregory was not a philosopher as was Augustine; and neither was he a predestinarian or monergist; and he did not share the latter's triadology, ecclesiology, nor his idea of inherited guilt. This Pope was above all an ascetic; he admired no man more than St Benedict of Nursia.

e. The final phase in the history of Augustinianism before the rise of Scholasticism occurs during the so-called "Carolingian Renaissance," the age of Alcuin of York (735-804) and the *Libri Carolini*.[49] Among the Frankish intellectuals, Augustine would become the greatest of the Fathers. His educational theories were at the heart of Alcuin's religious curriculum for the Carolingian schools and Charlemagne himself not only attended classes on Augustine, but slept with a copy of *The City of God* under his pillow. Alcuin's *De fide sanctae Trinitatis* rests on his dialectic or, as Wallace-Hadrill observes, "Augustine was the bedrock of his argument."[50]

But Charlemagne and Alcuin had wrought something with their "Augustinian revival" they could not have presaged. To be sure, for several generations, the Frankish Church would achieve a relative doctrinal calm; and she was curiously un-Augustinian on the subjects of grace and predestination. The catechumen was taught that faith without works is dead and grace wholly resistible. More than one Frankish Council, including the Council of Paris (829), reaffirmed the ancient synergism. Augustine, indeed, was read and many of his ideas in circulation, but he had not yet reached the status of *doctor super omnes*.

His apotheosis, however, would not be achieved until the middle of the 9th century, with the debates,

in part, sparked by King Charles the Bald himself (823-877) who encouraged academic debate, for example, by dispatching questionnaires on points of dispute to contemporary scholars. None was more significant than the inquiries, sent to numerous schools, about the immateriality of God. These questions seem to have arisen out of more general problem of the soul's analogy to Him and its relation to space.

At the Benedictine Monastery of Corbie (near Amiens), the famous scholar and controversialist, Ratramnus,[51] argued that matter and spirit were antithetical, and on the basis of numerous "patristic texts," concluded in *De anima* --- which drew heavily on the metaphysics of Augustine --- that the immateriality of the soul (and, therefore, God) was proven, among other things, by its necessary opposition to the materiality of the body. Not everyone agreed with Ratramnus --- his indebtedness to Augustine's *De quantitate animae* notwithstanding. They did not accept his conclusion nor its implications.

On another of the King's questions --- concerning the Eucharist --- Ratramnus clashed with Radbertus Paschasius over the Real Presence of the Lord in the Sacrament. Both wrote treatises entitled *De corpore et sanguine Domini*, and both appealed to the authority of Augustine. Ratramnus controverted the doctrine supported by his foe, which declared the Eucharist to be genuinely the transubstantiated Body and Blood of Christ. He asserted against Radbertus that an ineradicable difference exists between things physical and things spiritual --- even as there was between Christ's spiritual and physical bodies; hence, the Eucharist is only a memorial.

Some sided with Ratramnus (if not theologically,

philosophically), others with Radbetus. There was little doubt that their arguments were based on Augustinian premises. More importantly, it became increasingly evident that neither this nor any other theological issue would be resolved without the wisdom of the "Father" which the antagonists invoked --- Augustine, Bishop of Hippo. Yet, there was a greater problem: who offers the right interpretation of Augustine? There was now more interest in him and his teachings than ever before.

Gottschalk of Mainz (803-869),[52] as the disciple of Ratramnus, claimed to be the true heir of Augustine. He had studied at Corbie with the result that he became an enthusiastic proponent of double predestination, as taught in Ratramnus's two volume, *De praedestinatione Dei*. Like his master, Gottschalk believed himself to be following Augustine in holding that God does indeed predestine some men to everlasting bliss and others to eternal torment. At the same time, he insisted that predestination did not eliminate the necessity of human freedom and accountability.

The loudest protests to Gottschalk's interpretation of Augustine came from the monasteries, even as before. The leaders of the opposition were Hrabanus Maurus of Mainz, Gottschalk's former abbot at the Monastery in Fulda; and the remarkable Hincmar (806-882), Archbishop of Reims, who skilfully argued that not only was the idea of double predestination inimical to the Christian revelation; but, also, both free will and moral independence are concepts intrinsic to the Christian soteriology; and, consequently, that Christ suffered and died for all, "for the unfaithful and the unbelieving as well as the elect."[53] To refute Gottschalk, Hincmar wrote *De praedestinatione Dei et*

libero Arbitrio; and also the triadological *De una non Trina deitate*.

The Council of Mainz (848) condemned Gottschalk, largely through the efforts of Hincmar. Nevertheless, the former defiantly reaffirmed his belief in twofold predestination and sharply accused his opponents of abandoning the doctrine of "blessed Augustine" for the "semi-Pelagianism of Cassian and Gennadius of Marseilles." The next year, at Quierzy, Hincmar arraigned him before the episcopal assembly which deprived him of holy orders and confined Gottschalk to the Monastery of Hautvillers.

If the Archbishop imagined that peace had come, his hopes were dashed by the intrusion of John Scotus Erigena "into the field of patristic theology."[54] He also claimed to have drawn the first principles of his philosophy and theology from "the thought of St Augustine," a claim which led him to conclude that Gottschalk was next to Pelagius on the theological spectrum. Those sympathetic to Gottschalk, such as the learned Bishop Prudentius of Troyes, were insensed, demanding to know whether Erigena and those like him were under the delusion that they alone had read and understood Augustine.

Florus, Deacon of Lyons, agreed with Gottschalk's view of predestination, but not with his treatment of free will. Moreover, he saw in the attack upon Gottschalk "a hidden way of charging blessed Augustine with heresy" --- *vel beatum Augustinum latenter quasi haereticum accusat*.[55] His fury was directed principally at Erigena, who had announced that any idea of grace as the result of predestination must abort all semblance of free choice. According to Florus, however, Augustine (i.e., Gottschalk) was

misrepresented, for he had indeed propounded a charitology which allows for freedom along with his predestinarian theology.

It seemed as though Florus and Prudentius would not prevail, but not two years after the second Council of Quierzy (853), an assembly of bishops was held in southern Gaul, at Valence (855), which reversed its decision and threw its support to Florus and Prudentius. The Council drew up a series of pro-Gottschalkian propositions while ignoring the protestations of Hincmar. Valence decreed by its Third Canon "a predestination to life and a reprobation to death."[56] The next year, "an exhausted compromise" in Hincmar's favor was reached at the Council of Douzy.

The controversies of this period --- and I have mentioned only a few --- whatever their perceived outcome, are far more interesting for their implications than their history. Whatever may have been the preeminence Augustine before the great intellectual struggles of the Carolingian period, he became, as a result of them, forever the supreme patristic authority in the West; only the matter of rightly interpreting him remained a problem.

Henceforth, Western religious writers would drape themselves in the mantle of Augustine. Anselm, Aquinas, Bonaventure will call themselves his true disciples, but so would the Protestant Reformers and, later, the 17th century Jansenists.

3. The Authority of Augustine in the East

In the Orthodox Churches of the East, there is

little or no memory of Augustine. Until recently, he had no cultus --- no icons,[57] no liturgical canon, no feast day in the Orthodox world,[58] no temples and no person named for him; no hagiography --- simply no visible evidence of sanctity. For "the greatest genius the Church has ever produced" (Tixeront), the void is truly remarkable.

Nevertheless, Augustine was not unknown in the East. We hear his name mentioned in connection with the Pelagian heresy, in the speeches and letters addressed to several Ecumenical Councils; and in the works of several Fathers before, we learn of him in St Photios' *Mystagogy of the Holy Spirit*.[59] The 11th century manuscript of St James' Liturgy allegedly carries his name. The Bishop of Hippo's ideas will be visited upon 14th century Byzantium in the guise of Barlaam the Calabrian; and, at the Council of Florence, on the furrowed brow of St Mark Eugenicos. Augustine's theology figured prominently in the early works of George Kourteses (St Gennadios Scholarios). Augustine, as we have seen, would gain a certain fame in Russia with "the revolution of Peter the Great"; and, in the Middle East and Greece, during the "second crusade" of the 17th and 18th centuries.

a. As I have already said, Augustine came to the attention of the East Romans during the Pelagian controversy. The Emperor Theodosios the Younger invited him to the 3rd Ecumenical Council, but Augustine died before the message arrived. Ostensibly, at that Council St Cyril of Alexandria, in his *Ad Theodosios*, cited *Sancti Augustini ad Bonifacium comitem...* The Greek text is wanting, however. Augustine wrote to the Patriarch of Alexandria in 416 and 420 concerning the Pelagians.

Twenty years later, at the 4th Ecumenical Council, St Pope Leo the Great is said to have quoted Augustine in the appendix to his *Tome* (the Latin text is lost). Not without interest is the fact that the research for the document was undertaken by Leo's personal secretary, Prosper of Aquitaine, the leader of the Augustinian party.[60] This fact is supposed to explain, at least in part, the "Augustinian bias" of the *Tome*. But Prosper's knowledge of Augustine's christology is open to question; and St Leo himself was no Augustininan, as we shall see.

St Leontios of Byzantium (485-543) referred to Augustine as διδάσκαλος καὶ πάτηρ in his *Liber de Sectis* (III, 4 PG 86 [1] 1216C); but Leontios may have read only St Leo's *Tome*, because nothing in this or any of his works suggests that Leontius was familiar with Augustine's doctrine. Likewise, quoting Augustine in his letters to the 5th Ecumenical Council, as some historians argue, is supposed to reveal the Emperor Justinian's dependence on the *Tome*.[61] Particularly significant are his exhortations to the Council which, if we may believe Charles Moeller, suggests his acceptance of more than one doctrinal tradition in the Orthodox Church.[62]

b. The historical evidence establishes that St Photios the Great knew Augustine only in translation. The Patriarch's writings show no acquaintance with his opinions, save that the Bishop of Hippo was an "alleged" proponent of the *filioque*. For all his learning, Photios had very little knowledge of the Latin Fathers. Only during the dispute with the Franks was it augmented; and, perhaps, only with excerpts from the writings of those West Roman Fathers provided by the Carolingian scholars. He seems, nevertheless, to

have believed that the patristic texts were adulterated by them. Photios, judging from *The Mystagogy of the Holy Spirit*, was unwilling to admit that the errors attributed to "Sts Augustine, Ambrose and Jerome, etc." were "plainly taught by them."[63]

c. The most ancient manuscript of the Greek Liturgy of St James that we possess dates to the 9th century; but it manifestly presupposes an earlier text. The critical Greek edition with the Latin translation (in *Patrologia Orientalis* [vol. 26], ed. by R. Gaffin. Paris, 1946) includes a diptych with the name of Augustine. S. Salaville notes that this list is absent from the *textus receptus*.[64] The inclusion of Augustine's name in the official Roman Catholic version of the Liturgy is arbitrary.[65] Neither do we know, moreover, what the Crusaders may have done to the manuscript(s) while they occupied the city of Jerusalem (1099-1187).

d. With the Crusades came not only Western knights, but Western ideas, especially after the fall of Constantinople in 1204. There came, too, religious controversy, none more epochal than the theological altercation between St Gregory Palamas and Barlaam the Calabrian. Contrary to the opinion of Fr John Meyendorff, the struggle between them was not "a domestic quarrel between Byzantine humanists and monks."[66] It was precisely a clash between Latin and Orthodox theology. Barlaam was an Augustinian.[67]

Barlaam visited Mt Athos and, among other things, introduced its monks to the cataphatic theology (e.g., God *qua* being with attributes, etc.) of the post-Orthodox West, and also the idea of "the created gift of sanctifying grace."[68] Palamas saw immediately the connection between the Calabrian's theology and

soteriology, that is, the failure to distinguish between God's Essence and His uncreated Energies implies an ontological dualism between God and the world and, consequently, the impossibility of deification.[69] Created grace cannot lead to "participation in the divine Nature."

Grace, said the Archbishop of Thessalonica, is uncreated, a mysterious extension of the divine Nature. Moreover, grace and the other Energies (e.g., the divine Light) are not to be confused with the "generation" of the Son and the "procession" of the Holy Spirit from the Father. St Gregory also made a pertinent comment about the divine Knowing.

> If the Energies of God differ in no way from the divine Essence, then, neither will they differ from one another. Therefore, God's Will differs in no way from His Foreknowledge and, consequently, either God does not foreknow all things --- because He does not will all that occurs --- or else, He ordains evil, since He foreknows it. Now either He does not foreknow all things, which is the same as saying that He is not God; or He is not good, which is the same thing as saying He is not God. It is certain, however, that the divine Foreknowledge differs from the divine Will and that both differ from the divine Essence.[70]

Whether Barlaam understood the necessity of the distinction between the Energies and Essence in God without which the creature cannot "partake of the divine Nature" (II Pet. 1:4), I cannot say; and whether he believed that Augustine formulated a doctrine of

deification, I do not know. It is clear, however, that his theology was post-Orthodox, probably the Thomist interpretation of Augustine.

The Calabrian's teaching on created grace[71] and the nature of salvation, then, clearly excludes human participation in "the Glory of God," a teaching so dear to the Apostles.[72] Barlaam, his mind shaped by Augustine's *De Trinitate*, argued, for example, that the "light" revealed to the Patriarchs, Prophets and Apostles was transitory and symbolic. St Gregory went to much trouble to persuade him that the Glory revealed to holy men and women in this life is identical with "the inapproachable Light" in which God now dwells and which will be our common and permanent experience in the Age to Come.[73] Also, Palamas rejected the *lumen gloria* of Latin (and Augustinian) theology by which the elect will see the divine Essence.

e. St Mark of Ephesos (1391-1444) did not know Latin. He read Augustine's *De Trinitate* in Greek translation. Whatever he knew of the African's teachings he learned in Italy.[74] Mark was not afraid to criticize him during the debates at the Council ofFlorence; nevertheless, he spoke of Augustine as μακάριος αὐγουστῖνος.

St Mark was a man of tradition and one would not expect him, whatever his personal views, to denounce Augustine as a heretic when so many Fathers regarded him as a "saint" and "teacher." Conscious of it or not, all those things which Mark despised in the Latin mind were initiated by Augustine. In truth, his refusal to sign the declaration of Union (1439) was a repudiation of the Latin tradition whose "major formulator" was Augustine (Wilson-Kastner). What else was he doing when, at his deathbed, he urged George

Scholarios "to commit Aristotle to the flames, lest he lead you astray?"[75] Mark's plea was intended for all those who would recruit pagan thought to demonstrate by "reason" what must be held by "faith."

e. The career of St Gennadios II (1405-1472) was unusual. George Kourtesis, surnamed "Scholarios," was drawn to the life of scholarship through the preaching of St Symeon of Thessalonica. Also, George was self-taught, studying not only the Fathers, but Western savants. He translated into Greek Gilbert de la Porée's *De sex Principiis* and *Summa logicales* by Peter of Spain. Above all, he admired Thomas Aquinas whose *De Ente et Essentia* and commentary on Aristotle's *De anima* he rendered into Greek. He also produced resumés of Aquinas' *Summa contra Gentiles* along with *prima* and *prima secundae* of his *Summa contra Theologica*. "I doubt whether Thomas has any more fervent disciple than me," Scholarios wrote in the Introduction to his translation of *De Ente et Essentia*.

Yet, George claimed to follow the Fathers of the Church --- Sts Dionysios of Alexandria, Basil, Chrysostom, Athanasios and Cyril of Alexandria as well as "the three ecumenical lights of the Church, Augustine, Theodoret and Maximos the Confessor." The "most divine of all" was St John of Damascos. Scholarios called St Gregory Palamas, φωστῆρ τοῦ χοροῦ τῶν διδασκάλων.[76] At first, he disliked St Photios, blaming him in great measure for the division of the Churches; but later he will regret his initial animosity.

After reading Photios' *Mystagogia*, Scholarios was persuaded that St Hilary of Poitiers, St Ambrose and St Jerome all had adopted the *filioque*.[77] He came to believe that the Holy Spirit issued from the Father and

the Son, embracing the arguments of Aquinas and Augustine. Scholarios's library contained a copy of Maximos Planoudes translation of *De Trinitate* as well as Pseudo-Augustine's *Soliloques* which he cherished as a treatise by the Bishop of Hippo himself. The Saint quoted Augustine profusely in his *Prolegomena to the Physics of Aristotle* (1431).

So intense was his devotion to Augustine that he wanted the *filioque* added to the Nicean Creed. He had accepted the triadological formula --- ὁμολογοῦμεν τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα ἀϊδίως ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ υἱοῦ ὡς ἀπὸ μίας ἀρχῆς καὶ μοναδικῆς προβολῆς ἐκπορεύεται.[78] The Father and the Son are one principle not two, that is, the Father and the Son are the same principle from which the Spirit proceeds. In *Obstacles to Religious Peace*, he blamed the Council of Ephesos (431) for not adding the *filioque*. With no prejudice to the Creed, he said, the addition could be made for the sake of "reunion." In any case, the trinitarian differences between "the Latins" and "the Greeks" is based on a semantical misunderstanding.

Following the *Contra Graecos de Processione Sancti Spiritus* of Manuel Kalekas, Scholarios maintained that many Greek verbs have the same sense as the familiar εκπορευεσθαι which, as everyone knows, may signify the eternal procession of the Holy Spirit "from (ἐκ) the Father" or, as some of the Greek doctors taught, from the Father "through (διά) the Son." There is no reason to deny that the Son is not the intermediary cause of the Spirit's procession from the Father is not the primary cause. Augustine (whom Kalekas called *beatus Augustinus, quem summum et excellentissimum doctorem*), in fact, made the same distinction and employed the single Latin word, *procedere*, in both cases.[79]

St Gennadios followed his Westernizing course until something very dramatic happened: the repose of St Mark of Ephesos (23 June 1444), to whose deathbed he was summoned and there bequeathed the leadership of the anti-unionist forces within the Byzantine Church.[80] Now he reproved the Latins for their perversion of Christian trinitarianism and their distortion of the Creed. He was no longer satisfied with his previous theological analyses; instead he promoted the Orthodox formula ἐκ πατρός μόνον ἐκπορεύεται;[81] and sharply distinguished between the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father and ἡ πρόοδος οἰκονομικός (πέμψις) from the Son. He also equated "love" with the Trinity and not merely the Holy Spirit.[82]

Thus, in the year 1450, the year George Kourteses entered the Monastery of Pantokrator (from whence he was plucked by the Turks to become the first Patriarch of the the fallen Constantinople and Exarch of the *rum millet* in June of 1453) and took the name Gennadios, both Thomas Aquinas and Augustine ceased to be theological authorities for him. The spiritual accolades ("most wise Thomas," "most blessed Augustine") gradually disappeared from his writings. His repugnance for Patriarch Photios vanished. Relevant, then, is the fact that in *Providence and Predestination* (1459, 1467, 1470), he discoursed on the subject of predestination and free will with no mention of Augustine. St Gennadios made the clear statement that man achieves virtue without divine compulsion, although not without grace. God's predestination depends on His Foreknowledge --- ἔχει γὰρ προηγουμένην τὴν πρόγνωσιν ἧς ἄνευ οὐκ ἂν ὁ προορισμὸς εἴη.[83]

f. During "the captivity of the great Church," the name of Augustine is little heard in the East. It

is found in the writings of the Venetian Greek and lover of classical humanism, Maximos Margounios (d. 1602); in the writings of the famous Dositheos, Patriarch of Jerusalem (1669-1702); and in the notorious *Confession* commonly attributed to "the Calvinist Patriarch," Cyril Loukaris (1572-1638). In his *Treatise on Unleavened Bread*, the 18th century lay theologian Eustratios Argenti referred to Augustine as a Father of the Church, albeit one who had fallen into some errors.[84] Eugenios Boulgaris (1717-1806) established a school on the Holy Mountain where he taught the works of Augustine, among other Western writers. Boulgaris was expelled from Mt Athos for "modernism."

St Nikodemos, not unfamiliar with Western literature, recieved Augustinian pericopes from Uniate visitors to the Holy Mountain. He much appreciated Augustinian spirituality which he did not fail to praise in his books. Noteworthy, too, is the fact that while most modern Greek scholars have no doubts about the authenticity of the Augustinian literature which had come into their hands, Nikodemos and Dositheos were certain that that literature had been corrupted by clever editing, probably the work of the Dominicans or Jesuits.

g. Not without good reason, wealthy Greek families, especially the merchant class (*Phanariotes*), sent their sons to Western schools.[85] In fact, most of the major figures of post-Byzantine Orthodoxy attended Italian, German and English universities, e.g., Cyril Loukaris was a student at Padua as were Gabriel Severos and Meletios Pigas. One must not be surprised that the East was flooded with Western ideas, including the ideology of the French Revolution. These students,

returning East, prepared for the intellectual invasion of the West. Necessarily part of its baggage was the theology which had ruled Europe for a millennium, the root of which was Augustine of Hippo. Since the 19th century, very few modern Orthodox intellectuals have challenged his right, one way or another, to be placed on the patristic roll or the Church calendar.

h. Michel Jugie was both astonished and puzzled to find that Augustine had been so long forgotten in the East. From the 8th century to the end of the 13th century, he tells us, the Bishop of Hippo was completely ignored. St Ambrose and several other Western Saints were mentioned in the 10th century *Menologies* of St Symeon Metaphrastes and of Emperor Basil II; but not Augustine. Jugie was grateful to the Byzantine humanists for having revived interest in him. There has been, he says, attempts in the post-Byzantine era to rehabilitate Augustine.

In Russia, much the same thing happened, largely as the result of Peter the Great's westernizing policies which enthusiastically welcomed European sectarian thought. No one among the Tsar's minions cultivated the fame of Augustine more than his favorite Archbishop, Theophan Prokopovich, who occupied the chair of dogmatic theology at the Kievan Seminary from 1711 to 1716. Thanks to the efforts of such men, the works of Augustine were gradually translated into Russian; and likewise, St Jerome and the other Latin Fathers --- albeit Jugie was not willing to certify the fidelity of the translations from the Latin originals.[86]

Near the end of the 19th century, numerous scholarly studies about Augustine began to appear. An article by A.P. Lopukhine, *Augustine*, was printed in

The Encyclopedia of Orthodox Theology ([tome I], St Petersburg, 1904, 102-112), in which the author reviewed the history of Augustinianism in Russia. He was shocked to learn that this "doctor of the Church" --- whose doctrine was unquestionably Christian --- had no cultus in Russia.[87]

Augustine's name was nowhere to be found in the ancient Slavonic calendars, neither in the liturgical books nor in the *Tcheti Minei* of Metropolitan Macari (d. 1564), nor in the hagiography of St Dimitri of Rostov; nor even in the codex 1891 of the Library of the Synod of Moscow.[88] He was not mentioned by Peter Moghila in his *Orthodox Confession*. Although several Russian writers of the 18th and 19th centuries read with approval several of Augustine's books,[89] yet nowhere in the history of this Orthodox land has been discovered a temple, an icon, a hymn (troparion) in his honor; nor did Orthodox Christians take his name. So it has been throughout church history. Early in the life of the Orthodox West, Augustine gained a certain prominence, even attracting disciples. He was not so successful in the East. As the record shows, there is little memory of him there.

If Augustinianism failed to have serious impact on Orthodoxy, it is precisely because of her fidelity to the patristic tradition.

FOOTNOTES

1. *A Guide to The Thought of St Augustine*, trans. by R.J. Bastain, Chicago, 1960, p. 6.

2. *Sed liber ille ipsius exhortationem continent et philosophiam* (Conf. III, iv, 7 PG 32 685).

3. See A. Harnack & F.C. Coneybeare, "Manichaeism," in *The Encyclopedia Britannica* (vol. 17), New York, 1911, 572-578.

4. Portalié, *A Guide....*, p. 10.

5. *Confessions* V, xi, 21 716.

6. *Ibid.*, V, xiv, 25 718.

7. *A Guide...*, p. 12.

8. Augustine believed Platonism to be, whatever its faults, wholly compatible with Christianity. "I am confident," he wrote, "that I will find in the Platonists nothing offensive to our sacred Scriptures" --- *apud Platonicos me interim quod sacris nostris non reperturum esse confido* (*Contra Acad.*III, xx, 43 PL 32 957). It is a conviction he would maintain all his life (see chapter III).

9. *Confessions* VII, xii, 30 763.

10. *Ego dico peccatum non esse, si non propria voluntate peccetur: hinc esse et praemium, quia propria voluntate recta facimus. Aut poenam meretur, qui peccat invitus, debet et praemium mereri, qui bene facta invitus...* (*Contra Fort.*, 21 PL 42 122).

11. *Quamdiu ergo portamus imaginem terreni hominis, id est, quamdui secundum carnem vivimus, qui vetus etiam hominem nominatur, habemus necessitatem consuetudinus nostrae, ut non quod volumnus faciamus...Lex autem peccati est, ut quicumque peccaverit, moriatur. Ab ista lege liberamur cum justi esse coeperimus* (*op. cit.*, 22 125).

12. "Augustine in 413-415 shows that he has either forgotten or abandoned positions which he had taken in his earlier anti-Manichean works," observes R.F.Evans, "and these bear directly upon his polemic against Pelagius" (*Pelagius: Inquiries and Reappraisals*. New York, 1968, p. 86). Reuter also notes that Augustine espoused no idea of "original sin" in his anti-Donatist writings (*Augustinische Studien*, 15).

13. Following the mysterious Ambrosiaster, Augustine erroneously translated Romans 5:12 --- "Wherefore as by one man sin came into the world, and death by sin; so death passed upon all men, for all have sinned." Ambrosiaster may have learned from Origen (See Chapter IV, note 29).

14. *De bapt. c. Don.* IV, 5, x, 16 PL 43 156-164.

15. See P. Brown, "The Patrons of Pelagius: the Roman Aristocracy Between East and West," *The Journal of Theological Studies* XXI (1970), 56-72.

16. *Ibid.*, 58.

17. This sole fragment of Pope Zosimus's encyclical is preserved in Prosper of Aquitaine (*Liber c. coll.* V, 2 PL 51 227BC).

18. St Vincent of Lerins, for example, directed his *Commonitoria* against Augustine *"insofern auch er sich zum semipelagianismus bekennt und die Lehre Augustinus fuer ein Haeresie haelt"* (Bardenhewer, O., *Geschichte die altkirchlichen Literature* [vol. 15], Freiburg, 1924, 581).

19. "The Life of Augustine," in *Early Christian Biographies* (*The Fathers of the Church* [vol. 15], ed. by R.J. Deferrari, New York, 1952, p. 124).

20. Mansi, J.D., ed., *Sacrorum conciliorum nova et*

amplissima collectio (vol. 4), 455. The Pope's defense of Augustine is tepid, displaying no knowledge of the African's writings. Celestine merely commands that Christians confess "the grace of God whose operation and value must not be minimized" --- *quia ad confitendum gratiam Dei, cuius operi ac dignationi nihil penitus subtrahendum.* Although there is no doubt about the authenticity of Celestine's letter, some serious questions remain concerning the *capitulae* (against the so-called "semi-Pelagians") attached to it. He did not compose them (Portalié, *A Guide...*, p. 317f). See footnote 27 below.

21. See the next chapter.

22. Henry Chadwick observes that Prosper of Aquitaine, the new leader of the Augustinian party, was also secretary of St Leo. It was "under his moderating influence [that Prosper] withdrew from the full-blooded predestinarianism of Augustine's last years" (*The Early Church*, Hammondsworth, 1969, p. 234).

23. Although Augustine wrote *De opere monarchorum* (c. 400) and a long letter (*Ep.* 211) on the subject of the monastic life, he seems to have made no impact on the primitive Benedictines. He left no rule, despite the quasi-monastic community in which he lived with his students (See the discussion in P. Schaff, *History of the Christian Church* [vol. 3]: *From Constantine to Gregory the Great* [311-600], New York, 1891, p. 994).

The so-called *Regula prima* is not the work of Augustine, but the product of 7th century Spanish monasticism; likewise the *Regula secunda* and *tertia*. The "rules" have no vogue until the 12th century whatever their development and influence in the Latin West before that time. There is also some question about the Augustinian authorship of Letter 211 from which these *regulae* were ostensibly adapted (L. Bouyer, *The Spirituality of the New Testament and the Fathers* (vol. 1), trans. by M.R. Ryan, Paris, 1960, p. 492f).

24. Vincent's *Commonitoria* were an indirect attack upon Augustinianism, attempting to show its inconsistency with the Christian Tradition. Yet, Augustine is never named and never abused in this

treatise "and that is in accord with the letter of Celestine" (G. Weigel, *Faustus of Riez*, Philadephia, 1938, p. 49f & note 77). Noteworthy is the remark of Owen Chadwick, that St Vincent's famous canon, *quod ubique, quod semper, quod omnibus* was probably directed at Augustine, a canon on which "Augustine's theology falls to the ground" (*John Cassian*, Cambridge [Eng.], 1968, p. 120). R. Seeberg writes, *"mit seinem* (Vincent) *kanon Augustins Lehre zuelimineren"* (*Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte* [bd. 2]. Leipzig, 1910, 531).

25. In a letter, a certain Ennodius described an unnamed African bishop (probably Augustine) as *toxica Libycae pestis* and *arenosus coluber* (Ep., II, 19 PL 63 500).

26. See the discussion in Seeberg, *op.cit.*, 506f.

27. As already mentioned, Pope Celestine called upon the bishops of Gaul to end the defamation of Augustine. He desired peace. He wanted nothing written against the man who had served the Church for so long and so well. As for the points in dispute, Celestine announced that the ancient rule of the Church be followed. Novelty must not be allowed to corrupt true doctrine (*Ep. Coel. ad episc. XXI Gall.* PL 50 528). Prosper wrote a syllabus of Augustinian tenets --- *Indiculus Coelestini* --- a manuscript, inherited from the Latin Middle Ages, to which is appended an encyclical attributed to Celestine. Historians have proven that this Pope was not the author.

28. *Coll.* XVII, PL 49 946B.

29. Seeberg writes that the semi-Pelagians represented *"einer aeltern Anschauungweise, die den neuen Gedanken der Kirchlichen Rechten sich nur zum Teil aneigen konnten, sie verhielten sich daher zu Augustin aehnlich wie der semiarianer zu Athanasius vieles imponierte ihnen aber das Ganze erschien ihnen der novitas verdaechtig Aehnlich wie dieser semipelagianer hatten die aelter Fuehrer, wie Hieronymus und auch Ambrosius, gedacht* [vgl. St Vincent, *comm.* xxiv, 34]. *Sie hatten so unrecht nicht, wenn sie meinten sich gegen eine neuerung verteidigen zu sollen"* (*Lehrb.*

d. Dogm. [bd. 2], 506). The Roman Catholic historian, J. Tixeront, concedes that "St Hilary [of Poitiers], St Optatus, and even St Jerome made a certain number of statements which now would be looked upon as Semi-Pelagian" (*History of Dogmas* [vol. 2], trans. by H.L.B. St Louis, 1914, p. 280). As we shall see, the number of Western Fathers in "the semi-Pelagian camp" was far more than Tixeront begrudgingly grants. All the Fathers, including the ecclesiastical writers, Tertullian, Marius Victorinus, Ambrosiaster, Arnobius the Younger, were non-Augustinian. To a man, the Greek Fathers were "semi-Pelagian" and non-Augustinian in their charitology and soteriology (See N.P. Williams, *The Ideas of the Fall and Original Sin.* London, 1927; and N.G. Globoukovsky, "Grace in the Greek Fathers," in *The Doctrine of Grace.* ed. W.T. Whitley. New York, 1931, pp. 61-105).

30. Chadwick, O., *John Cassian*, p. 188. Notable is the fact that St John quotes Augustine in *On the Incarnation of the Lord Against Nestorius* (VII, 2). He coldly refers to him as "Augustine the priest of Hippo Regiensis." Some MSS add the words *magnus sacerdos* which has no authority (See P. Schaff H. Wace, ed., *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers* [vol. 11], London, 1894, p. 618 note 9). St John may have placed some value on Augustine's christology, a trust that was misplaced.

31. *The Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church.* trans, by The Fellowship of St Alban and St Sergius, London, 1957, p. 198.

32. See my "*Peccatum Originali:* The Pelagian Controversy," in *The Byzantine and Patristic Review*, III, 1-2 (1984), 39-53.

33. Werner Jaeger is bemused by "the formulas of the leading Semi-Pelagians" who, as he believes, are "a little more adapted to Augustine's view" (rather than Pelagius); "but, on the whole, they stick to what they call 'tradition'" (Intro. of *Two Rediscovered Works of Ancient Christian Literature: Gregory of Nyssa and Macarius*, Leiden, 1954, p. 97).

34. *Coll.* II, 17; XIII, 16-17 PL 49 944C-945A.

35. *Ep. ad Graeco*, 7 (in *Opus Fausti Riensis, Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum* [vol. XXII]. Prague, 1891).

36. *Ep. ad Lucid.* PL 53 683.

37. The idea espoused by the Orthodox "friends" of Augustine (e.g., Fr Seraphim Rose, "*The Place of Blessed Augustine..,*" *The Orthodox Word* XIV, 2 [1978], 82) that St Faustus was a secret admirer of the African is nonsense. Faustus never referred to him as *beatissimus pontifex Augustini* or solemnly kept his feast day (!), or sought his intercession in prayer, etc. Such information could only have come from the spurious *In depositione Augustini* (Weigel, Faustus of Riez, p. 105). As C.J. Hefele says, Faustus "carries on a continuous warfare against Augustine" (*A History of the Councils of the Church* [vol. 4], trans. by W.R. Clark, Edinburgh, 1895, p. 24).

38. Mansi (vol. 7), 1007.

39. *Loc. cit.*

40. *A History of the Councils of the Church* (vol. 4), p. 24.

41. If the so-called "semi-Pelagians" lumped Jerome with Pelagius and Pelagius with Origen, one may argue that they did not sufficiently apprise themselves of these doctrines. Perhaps, on account of his association with Rufinus of Aquileia, they mistakenly judged Saint Jerome to be an Origenist (see chapter V).

42. Although Rome favored Augustine over Faustus, Professor Harnack writes in his *History of Dogma* ([vol. 5], p. 258), "yet Rome never took the trouble to really comprehend Augustinianism." For example, the Anglican Bishop Noel Hall mentions that St Pope Innocent I was ignorant of Augustine's "theory of apostolic succession." Thus, His Holiness denied that Arians receive the Holy Spirit, "since when their leaders departed

from the Catholic Faith, they lost the Spirit which they had originally received" ("Apostolic Succession," *Scottish Journal of Theology* XI (1958), 116). In a word, Innocent was unaware of Augustine's opinion concerning "the validity of heretical Sacraments." Interesting, too, is the fact that Pelagius *libellus fidei* defends the Nicean Creed; and, ironically, the confession was preserved in the Vatican (until modern times) as a sermon by Augustine (See the discussion in W.E. Phipps, "The Heresiarch: Pelagius or Augustine?" *Anglican Theological Review* LXII [April 1980], 125).

43. *A Guide...*, p. 319. From his letter it is clear that Hormisdas did not familiarize himself with the teachings of the semi-Pelagians who never denied "the absolute gratuity of grace" (PL 53 493).

44. See the discussion in F. Hofmann, "*Der Kamp Der Paepste in Chalkedon*," in *Das Konzil von Chalkedon* (bd. 2), ed. by A Grillmeier & H. Bacht. Wurzburg, 1959, 74f.

45. On the Scythian-Fulgentian connection, see A. Grillmeier, "*Vorbeitung des Mittelalters*," in *Das Konzil von Chalkedon* (bd. 2), 802-804.

46. *A History of the Councils of the Church* (vol. 4),p. 154. See Also D.M. Cappuyns, "*L'origine des 'Capitula' d'Orange 529*," *Recherches de Theologie ancienne et medievale* VI (1934), 121-142.

47. Mansi (vol. 7), 723.

48. *The History of Dogma* (vol. 5), p. 263. Dudden says that St Gregory "took up a position midway between Augustine and semi-Pelagianism..." In other words, St Gregory "made room for man's consenting and cooperating will and omitted the doctrines of irresistible grace and unconditional election" (*Gregory the Great: His Place, History and Thought* [vol. 2], London, 1905, p. 392). Professor C. Straw believes that Pope Gregory differs with Augustine on the nature of grace and sin, because the thinking of the Saint "is the product of monastic culture and is peculiarly

Eastern in flavor. It would be wrong to see Gregory as merely simplifying Augustine's position, for Gregory writes from such different assumptions" (*Gregory the Great: Perfection in Imperfection*, Los Angeles, 1988, p. 133). In truth, Gregory's ideas of grace are "closest to those of Cassian" (Owen Chadwick, *John Cassian*, Cambridge [Eng.], 1968, pp. 110-136). "If we compare the Christianity of Gregory with that of Augustine," writes Reinhold Seeberg, "we reach a remarkable conclusion: almost everything in Gregory has its source in the teachings of Augustine, and yet scarcely anything is Augustinian. That which was un-Augustinian in Augustine becomes the vital element of Gregory's semi-Augustinianism" (*Text-Book of the History of Doctrines* [vol. 2], trans. by C.E. Hay, Grand Rapids, 1954, p. 26).

49. The books (*libri*) of Carolingian scholars (*Carolini*) were initiated by Alcuin, Charlemagne's minister of education. Their motivation was a refutation of Nicea II (787) (Wallace-Hadrill, *The Frankish Church*, p. 230).

50. *Ibid.*, p. 211.

51. Ratramnus was the author of *Contra Graecorum opposita* (868), a contribution to the dispute between the Eastern Churches and the Franks. This treatise was a reply to St Photios' encyclical of 867.

52. Not unlike Augustine, Gottschalk was a philosopher as well as a theologian. "He was faithful to Augustine in both respects, rarely expressing any difference of opinion from Augustine's doctrine," Liebshuetz informs us, "albeit the philosophical aspect of his work is passed over in silence" ("*Develop. of Thought in the Carol. Empire*," p. 591). According to Wallace-Hadrill, it was at Corbie and at Orbais, that Gottschalk made his first serious acquaintance with Augustine... He came to Augustine as a trained grammarian. He was already equipped to face Augustine's theological positions with the weapons of dialectic and rhetoric as understood by the school of Alcuin" (*The Frankish Church*, p. 364f).

53. Hincmar quoted the 23rd homily of St Gregory the Great, his exegesis of John 13:23, "I must be lifted from the earth and so draw all men to me" (*De Praed.*, 27 PL 125 283C). The exegesis is traditional, that is, all humanity is called to salvation and all members of the Church are "elect." To support his argument, Hincmar appealed to several other Western writers, including the Venerable Bede who had studied Augustine for a method of Scriptural interpretation (See E.S. Duckett, *Anglo-Saxon Saints and Scholars*. New York, 1948, p. 62f.). Although accepting the authority of Augustine on political matters, Hincmar was not a predestinarian (See H. Schroers, *Hinkmar, Erzbischof von Reims*, Hildsheim, 1967, ss. 88-108).

54. Liebsheutz, p. 585.

55. *Liber adv. Joan. Scot.*, 4 PL 119 126A.

56. Mansi (vol. 15), 537-538.

57. In the West, the 6th century Frankish mosaic of Augustine (now in the Lateran Library) is the earliest portrait of him. It is isolated propaganda, however, the work of Augustine's "press-agents" in Gaul (See H. Marrou, *Saint Augustine and His Influence Through the Ages*, trans. by E. Hill, New York-London, 1962, p. 147f.).

The late 9th century Campanian (Naples) Calendar has the name *Augustini* (28 Aug.) without "of Hippo" or "of Canterbury" or some local Saint. Since 28 August is the date of Augustine "of Hippo's" death, it is assumed that he is the *Augustini*. Whoever he is, there are no signs in Naples of further cultus (See *Dictionnaire d'archeologie chretienne et de liturgie* [vol. 2, pt. 2], Paris, 1925, 1587, 1593); and Archmandrite Sergy, "Complete Menologion of the East," in *The Holy East* [vol. 2], Moscow, 1876).

In Greece, there is a fresco, allegedly a picture of Augustine, in Monastery of Barlaam of Meteora. Iconographically, the vestments, in particular the omophorion, belong, not to a 5th century bishop, but to the Seventy Apostles. The monastery of Meteora, built in the late Middle

Ages, was subject to intense Western influence. Also, an icon of Augustine seems to have appeared in 13th century Constantinople; but the city was then in the hands of the Crusaders.

Not many years ago, the famous iconographer, Photios Kontoglou, was commissioned to paint an icon of Augustine; but he could find no model. Finally, the name of Augustine occurs in the 11th century edition of St James Liturgy; but it is missing in the *textus receptus* (F.E. Brightman, *Liturgies Eastern and Western*, Oxford, 1896, pp. 55-57). See footnote 64.

58. The conspicuous absence of cultus for a person of such historical significance as Augustine is remarkable. As already mentioned, the recent attempts to rehabilitate Augustine stem from the personal initiative of Nikodemos Hagiorites. Even the date of his feast (15 June) its troparion found, for example, in the 19th century menologies of Philaret Goumilevsky and Archmandrite Sergy *"...emprunt...au Synaxaristes de Nicodème l'Haghiorite"* (Jugie, *"Saint Augustine dans la littérature théologique de l'Église russe,"* 394).

59. The origin of the idea that Augustine was truly Orthodox, while his errors the chicanery of some unknown Latin redactor, stems from St Photios who refused to believe that "St Augustine" (as well as other Western Fathers) was guilty of trinitarian heresy (See the discussion in R. Haugh, *Photios and the Carolingians: The Trinitarian Controversy*, Belmont [Mass.], 1975, pp. 151-153).

60. The passage in question seems to have been taken from his *Contra sermonem Arianorum*. A Greek translation of the *Tome* quotes *Ep. CXXXIV, 78 Expos. Fid.* which, in fact, is part of the *Libellus fidei* of Leporus (PL 31 1221-1230). See R.V. Sellers, *The Council of Chalcedon*, London, 1953, p. 95f.

61. St John the Grammarian of Caesarea defended Chalcedon against the Monophysites in a lost work. Much of its content is known through the writing of the 6th century Monophysite, Severus of Antioch, in his *Liber contra impium Grammaticum*. The latter cites John's patristic sources, including a host of Western Fathers --- Sts

Cyprian, Julian of Rome, Hilary of Poitiers, etc., but not the Bishop of Hippo. The extracts show that St John had at his disposal counciliar documents and other writings (see M. Richard, "Le florilége dyphisites du Ve et du VIe siecle," in *Konzil von Chalkedon* [vol. 1], 736).

62. *"De plus en plus, l'Orient se fige dan le respect exagére d'un seule tradition théologique: celle d'Alexandrie. Ce 'monotraditionlisme' est dû à l'influence enorme du Justinien. Au point de vue de schisme de 1054, le VIe siècle byzantine presente de symptômes inquiétants. Autant l'unité pronde de la 'catholica' se manifestait-elle extérieure"* ("Le chalcédonisme et néo-chalcédonisme en Orient de 451 à la fin du VIe siècle," in *Konzil von Chalkedon* [vol. 1]. 648-649).

63. See *On the Mystagogy of the Holy Spirit*, 70-72 (trans. by Holy Transfiguration Monastery. New York, 1983).

64. *"Une mention de Saint Augustin dans le diptyques de la liturgie grecque de Saint James," L'Année Théologique XI* (1950), 54 note 1.

65. *Ibid.*, 56.

66. *Introduction to the Study of Gregory Palamas.* trans. by T. Lawrence, London-New York, 1963, pp. 52-53; and Fr John's "Les debuts de la controverse hesychaste," *Byzantion* XXIII (1953), 87-120.

67. Romanides, J.S., "Notes on the Palamite Controversy and Related Topics," *The Greek Orthodox Theological Review* VIII, 2 (1960-1961), 194; and "Debate Over Theodore of Mopsuestia's Christology," *The Greek Orthodox Theological Review* V, 2 (1959-1960), 180ff, especially notes 144 & 145.

68. *"Barlaam introdusait en effect, pour la première temps en Orient, l'idée augustinienne que la grâce de Dieu en phénomène créé...,"* writes Fr Ranson (*"Le Lourd Sommeil Dogmatique de l'Occident,"* 22).

69. Augustine held a doctrine of deification early in his career which he was later to neglect. "Before we are made partakers of His immortality," declares the Bishop of Hippo, "He was first made a partaker of our mortality. However, He was made mortal, not of His Substance, but of ours. Thus, we are made immortal, not of our substance but of His..." (*Ennar. in Ps. CXLVI*, 11 PL 1906-1907). Such a construction of the doctrine verges on pantheism; but the consequence seems inevitable without the distinction between Essence and Energy (or Substance and Operation) in God. Not without relevance is the observation of Professor C. Yannaras that the development of rationalism and secularism in the West is the consequence of that theological methodolgy whose tradition reaches from Thomas Aquinas through Anselm of Canterbury to Augustine. In large measure, the direction they took was dictated by the absence of the distinction between the Essence and Energies of God, that is, their failure to delineate a doctrine of deification *à la* St Gregory Palamas ("Orthodoxy and the West," in *Eastern Churches Review* III, 3 (1971), 286-300). See Chap. III, footnote 81.

70. *Capita Phys., Theol., Moral., Pract.*, 100 PG 150 1189D-1192A.

71. "If you wish to understand the view of the Latin Church about grace," writes P. Wilson-Kastner, "and how it compares with the position of the Greek Church, we must look to Augustine" ("Grace and Participation in the Divine Life in Augustine," *Augustinian Studies* VII [1976], 35).

72. Romanides, J., "Debate over Theodore of Mopsuestia's Christology," 180-181.

73. See *Défense des saint Hesychastes* (vol. 1). ed. by J. Meyendorff. Louvain, 1959, 1, 3, 43f (p. 203f); and (vol 2), II, 3, 20 (pp. 429, 489).

74. *Responsio ad Quest.*, Lat., II, 41 (*Pat. Or.* [vol.15], ed. by R. Gaffin & F. Nau. Paris, 1920. St Mark suggests that St Gregory the Great did not agree with Augustine on the subject of life after death.

75. Ἀλλ' εἰ δεῖ τοῖς φίλοις πέμπειν ἢ διδόναι πυρί (*Ep. ad Marc Eph.* PG 160 746C). cf. φύγε Αἰγύπτου ἀμεταστρέπει. φύγε Σόδομα καὶ Γομόρα πρὸς τὸ ὄρος σώζου...φεῦ τῆς ἀφιλοσόφου διανοίας φιλόσοφου (*Marc Eph. ad. Geo. Scholarios*, 3 (*Pat. Or.* [vol. 15], 324-325).

76. *Concerning the Sunday of Orthodoxy* I, vi, 13 (*Georges Scholarios: Oeuvres complètes* [8 vols], ed. by L. Pettit, X.A. Siderides, M. Jugie, Paris, 1928-1936).

77. During his early career, Scholarios was a westernizer (λατεινόφρονις). He attended the Council of Florence (1439) as pro-union. At the same time, he knew little of the Latin Fathers (letting Augustine speak for them). As Jugie says, *"c'est qu'il ne les connaissait très imparfaitement et n'en avait point fait une étude personelle"*; and *"n'a pas eu d'histoire occident"* (Jugie, Introduction to volume one of *Oeuvres complète*, viii, xx).

78. *Ora. ad Synod oecum.*, 7 (*ibid.*, [vol. 1]). Scholarios initially considered the Council of Florence (1439) ecumenical.

79. *De process.*, II, v, 2 (*ibid.*, [vol. 2]); and his 1430 *Grammatikos*, I, 417-418 (vol. 8).

80. The Mantzouneas report to the Holy Synod of Greece simply ignores the personal development of St Gennadios as well as the chronology of his works. Most scholars divide the writing career of Scholarios into three periods: 1) *pro-union and pro-Western* (c. 1428 - 1444): chief works of this time were letters and short treatises in favor of the union. He became enamoured of of philosophy, especially Thomas Aquinas; 2) *opponent of Florence* (1444 - c. 1459): polemics against the Latins, including a book *On the Procession of the Holy Spirit* and a *Panegyric of Mark Eugenikos*. He made some translations of the philosophical works of Thomas Aquinas, but also wrote an apology for St Gregory Palamas against the Barlaamites, particularly Kalekas' *De essentia et operatione*. Gennadios rejects the Latin idea of purgatory. He

came to the defense of Aristotle against the Platonism of the Byzantine humanist, Gemistos Pletho; and 3) *from his resignation as Patriarch of Constantinople to his death* (c. 1459 - 1472): retiring to the St John the Baptizer Monastery in Seres (Macedonia), Gennadios devoted himself, among others things, to the defense of Orthodoxy against the Latins, Jews and Moslems. His dalliance with philosophy (including Aquinas and the Scholastics) as well as Augustinianism is finally over.

81. Gennadios' first treatise *On the Procession of the Holy Spirit* (he wrote three), was delivered before the autumn of 1444. Numerous ideas and images were drawn from Augustine's *De Trinitate*. In fact, writes Jugie, *"il n'utilise guére que de Trinitate, qui, il est vrai, est capital pour le subject"* (Introduction to vol. 2 of *George Scholarios: Oeuvres...*, xix). Also, it is historically interesting that when certain Greek intellectuals finally collected and edited *On the Procession of the Holy Spirit* (1626 or 1627), they dedicated the book to Cyril Loukaris, "the Calvinist Patriarch" (*op.cit.*, i-v).

82. *Process. Sp. Sanct.* I, ii, 1 [vol. 2].

83. *Providentia et Praed.* I, iii, 1 [vol. 8].

84. See Timothy Ware, *Eustratios Argenti*, Oxford, 1964, pp. 126-128.

85. See Steven Runciman's *The Great Church in Captivity*. Cambridge (Eng.), 1968, pp. 208-237.

86. "*Saint Augustin dans la littérature théologique de l'Eglise russe*," 390.

87. *Ibid.*, 394.

88. Fr Seraphim Rose admits that the Canon for Augustine, commissioned by Archbishop John Maximovitch, was unprecedented in the Russian Church. Such services "until then had not existed in the Slavonic Menaion...," ("The Place of Blessed Augustine...," in *The Orthodox Word*, XIV

[1978], 134).

89. Many 18th and 19th century Russian writers saw Augustine as a "mystic," not unlike other Western religious authors (Arndt, Silesius, Jacob Boehme, Molinus, Guyon, etc.). He was an authority for Russian Pietists, Romantics and occultists, because of his teaching that God is reached through the soul. Augustine was *the* "church father" for Idealists from Skovoroda to Solov'ev (See G. Florovsky, *Ways of Russian Theology* [vol. 1], Belmont [Mass.], 1979, p. 152f; and "*Westliche Einfluesse in der russichen Theologie*," *Kyrios* II, 1 [1937], 13f, 16f.).

Chapter II

The Patristic Witness

If we have chosen to give special attention to Augustine's theories of predestination, original sin and grace, it is because these things reflect more profoundly than anything else his world-view. A treatment of them, however, must wait for another chapter. For now the argument of this study requires us to examine the tradition of the Fathers, the tradition to which his advocates maintain he belongs.[1] Below is a summary and survey of teachings, East and West,[2] on the subjects of predestination, original sin and grace. It will provide the standard against which Augustinianism is judged.

1. The Fathers of the West

This section carries the reader through the Fathers of the West Christian Roman Empire, from St Clement of Rome to St Gregory the Great. It is a continuous tradition of those teachers of the Catholic Faith who, as many have wrongly assumed, are the predecessors and disciples of Augustine.

a. The first Western Father to whom we turn is

ST CLEMENT OF ROME (d. 96). We find nothing in his *Letters* to the Corinthians that remotely suggests predestination, original sin or coercive grace. Not that the Church had failed to take positions on these matters, but they were ordinarily not part of the Church's public teaching (κηρυγμα).

What we read in St Clement's exhortations to the Church at Corinth is the message that Christ brought "the grace of conversion to the whole world" (*I Cor.*, 7).[3] The Lord is "the Prince of Immortality" (*II Cor.*, 20), a comment which implies the nature of the redemption He wrought. Moreover, we are able to share in His victory, "the great life and immortality provided by the Holy Spirit" (*II Cor.*, 14). "The Spirit of Grace" Who is poured out upon us is the Spirit of God (*I Cor.*, 46). The Apostles, "minister's of grace," preach repentance with the help of the Holy Spirit (*I Cor.*, 8).

St Clement reminded the Corinthians that death governed the human race until the Advent of Christ. Now we have the Church to perpetuate His work, the Church with her "bishops whom the Apostles consecrated to continue their mission." "All the generations from Adam to this day have passed away," Clement affirmed, "but you were made perfect in love by the grace of God Who lives among His saints" (*I Cor.*, 50). Yet, man is free to resist His Will (*I Cor.*, 61). Clement made no mention of divine predestination. God, he concludes, establishes His works through His "operations" (*I Cor.*, 60).

b. ST IRENAEOS OF LYONS (d. 180) was a student of St Polycarp of Smyrna, the pupil of St John the Theologian. In his *Adversus Haereses*, Irenaeos explains the reason for the Incarnation. By virtue of

Adam's sin, his posterity has fallen into "death's bondage" (V, xix, 1).[4] Humanity, alienated from God by its mortality and corruptibility, could not enter into fellowship with Him. The human race could not escape the inheritance of death (V, i, 3). Thus,

> it behooved Him Who was to destroy sin, and redeem us from it and the power of death, that He Himself should be made that very same thing which he [Adam] was, that is, man; that he who had been seduced by sin into bondage, should have sin destroyed by a man and humanity thereby escape death (III, xvii, 7).

Before Christ, the human race was "a vessel of the devil, held under his sway" through sin and death (III, xxii, 1). Death, St Irenaeos wrote, is the source of corruption; but Christ came to liberate us from it and to bring incorruption, that is, immortality.

> God determined beforehand to bring man to perfection, to edify him by the revelation of His economy, that goodness might abound and the righteous perfected; and the Church might be fashioned after the Image of His Son and, consequently, realize the maturity of man at some future time, becoming ripe through such privileges as the vision and comprehension of God (IV, xxviii, 7).

By the Word of God came the gift of immortality to man, he who was "formed after His likeness (predestined according to the prescience of the Father, that we, who had as yet no existence, might come into being), and

made the first-fruits of creation, attaining the blessings of salvation known beforehand, according to the Energies of the Word..." (V, i, 1).

At the same time,

> ...there is no coercion with God, but good will towards us... And, therefore, does He give good counsel to all. In man, as in angels, He has placed the power of choice...so that those who yield obedience might justly possess what is good --- given indeed by God --- but preserved by themselves. On the other hand, they who do not obey, shall with justice fail to possess the good, but shall receive appropriate punishment; for God did kindly bestow on them what is good; but they themselves did not diligently keep it, nor deem it something precious, but poured contempt upon His great goodness (IV, xxxvii, 1).

Man has retained free will from the beginning, exclaims the Saint, "not merely in works, but also by his faith." Thus, Christ said, "according to your faith..." (Matt. 9:24); and "All things are possible to him that believes" (Mark 9:23). "Now all such expressions demonstrate that man is in his own power with respect to faith..." (IV, xxxvii, 5).

Grace, for Irenaeos, is a divine force which sustains both the universe and man who crowns it. Grace, therefore, "is absolutely necessary for everyone, since without grace men are like dry and sterile ground which has no humidity" (III, xvii, 2). The grace of salvation is given only to those who want and accept it. Whoever receives grace by faith and

enters the Church where the Holy Spirit dwells according to "the predestined economy" (III, xvii, 4) shall find eternal life (III, xxiv, 1).

c. ST HIPPOLYTUS OF ROME (d. 235) was a student of St Irenaeos, St Photios tells us in his *Bibliotheca* (Cod. 121). Like his teacher before him, Hippolytos recognized that grace is the source of every good, not only of salvation (*Apocal.* 3:7).[5] Soteriologically speaking, grace accounts for "creating Adam anew" (*Frag: Prov.*, 11). His renewal implies the rebirth of all things, for, as the pinnacle of the physical creation, the regeneration of "Adam" (man) involves the reformation of the cosmos (*Frag: Dan.* II, 19).

In his *Treatise on Christ and Anti-Christ* (n. 4), St Hippolytos describes the Incarnation as the union of the Divine and the human for the purpose of our salvation. The flesh of Christ is a "robe which He "weaved" for Himself, "uniting His own power with our mortal body, and by mixing (μῖξις) the Incorruptible with the corruptible...that He might save the perishing man." Because of that union, all who are in Christ become "a companion of the Deity, and a co-heir with Christ, no longer enslaved by passions and lusts, not wasted by disease. For thou hast become God..." (*Ref. omn. Haer.* X, 30).

d. One of the great Fathers of the African Church, ST CYPRIAN OF CARTHAGE (200-258) --- a Father whose authority Augustine often invoked --- offered a traditional picture of the divine Economy. He also used the word "grace" in many ways. To Lucius the martyr (*Ep.* LXXVIII, 1-2), Cyprian writes that "we who follow the footsteps of your confession, hope for an equal grace with your own. For he who is first in the race is first also for the reward." "We communicated

with you," he continues, "so that we who share with you one Spirit in the bond of peace might have the grace of your prayers and one crown of confession."

In *Testimonies Against the Jews*, Cyprian instructs his spiritual son, Quirinus, that "the liberty of believing or not is placed in free choice" (III, 52). He warned him, too, that the grace of baptism may be lost by those who fall from innocence (III, 27). To another (*Ep.* XXI), Cyprian asserted that we must "deserve God" (*promereri Deum*). Nevertheless, the grace by which we are saved comes only from Him, from "the heavenly Spirit," a grace which "flows incessantly everywhere and enriches everything abundantly" (*Ep.* I).

Thus, St Cyprian distinguished between a universal and generic "heavenly and spiritual grace" and the specific "ecclesiastical and saving grace" (*Ep.* XI, 15). The latter, of course, belongs only to the Church. She "floats" on grace, as the Ark of Noah floated on the waters. Consequently, she alone possesses the power of the holy Mysteries. They are not found among heretics who are outside the Church.[6]

Centuries later, in his dispute with the Donatists, Augustine would raise once more the question of "heretical sacraments," a matter which had long ago been settled. Curiously, the Bishop of Hippo found the Saint's letter to Fidus[7] valuable to his arguments. Cyprian said,

> But again: if even to the greatest sinners and those who had sinned much against God, when they subsequently believed, remission of sins is granted --- and nobody is hindered from Baptism and grace --- how much then ought we to shrink from hindering an infant who, being born

> after the flesh according to Adam, has contracted the contagion of the ancient death (*contagium mortis antiquae prima nativitate contraxit*), who approaches the more easily on this very account to the reception of the forgiveness of sins --- that to him are remitted not only his own sins, but the sins of another.

We observe the expression "forgiveness of sins" (plural) which ordinarily refers to adult baptism. Why, then, are infants baptized? Clearly to make them members of Christ. But St Cyprian refers to the "sins" of the infant. What "sins" could an infant have committed? How old an infant? He does not tell us.

There is something else --- to "remit" the sins of "another." Who is this "other?" Adam? But the "sins" of Adam are his own; and the use of the plural ("sins") excludes the idea of an inherited "sin" (singular). The "sins" of infant's parents, then? But the letter states "of another." One of the parents? --- which one and why? Perhaps, "another" is the human race, the substance of Adam, that is to say, the infant, necessarily affected by the sins of mankind ("another") of which he is part, remits when it is baptized, to some degree, those sins through his own regeneration.

e. According to ST HILARY OF POITIERS (300-367), all men have been condemned through Adam's sin (*Tr. in Ps.* lix, 4).[8] All his posterity is enslaved to the devil and death by virtue of *originis nostrae peccatis*.[9] The ancestral transgression, St Hilary calls a *vitium*; that is, each person has a proclivity towards evil, an inherited weakness, a corruption.

With the coming of Christ, however, the human condition has changed:

> The gifts and statutes of God will never again be set to naught as they were in the case of Adam who by his sin, his breaking of the law, lost happiness and assured mortality for himself and his children; not now, thanks to the redemption wrought by the Tree of Life, that is, by the Passion of the Lord. All that happens to us now is eternal (*Ps.* I, 18).

In Christ "the mortal gains eternity" (*De Trin.* I, 13). St Hilary recognized the possibility of a sinless life in this world through grace. For David prayed, "Take me from the way of iniquity," that is, he prayed for the *vitium* to be removed and his person to be sanctified by the Holy Spirit (*Ps.* CXVII, Daleth 8; He, 16). Grace is freely given, but the soul increases grace by overcoming sin. God grants perseverant grace to him who, with grace, conquers sin (*Ps.* CXVIII, He.12; Nun, 20). In other words, the individual is given "a measure of the Spirit" as he desires and deserves it (*De Trin.* II, 35).

Although we cannot be saved without the grace which purifies our faith and strengthens our resolve, grace is not irresistible. We are under no compulsion to do good or evil (*Ps.* II, 16; LI, 23). Thus, the sin God saw in Esau was not foreordained, anymore than the good of Isaac (*Ps.* LVII, 3). The elect are those who are worthy of election (*Ps.* CXVIII, teth 4; LXIV, 4). No person is excluded by the human condition from participating in the work of his own salvation. More precisely, the human race has inherited a "condition"

from Adam --- the *vitium* of mortality --- which only the grace of God eradicates (*De Trin.* X, 22).

f. ST JEROME OF BETHLEHEM (340-420) took the old Latin saying, "He who refuses to save a man from death is a murderer" to describe his attitude towards divine predetermination.[10] He was not alone in believing that God neither saves nor damns in advance, for "He judges the present, not the future" --- *Deus presentia judicat, non futura.* He gives the sinner every chance "to experience conversion and repentance" --- *ei potestatem conversionis et poenitentiae.*[11] Man is free to choose between good and evil. "We agree that, besides our own will, we depend on the help of God in the good we do and on the devil in evil" --- *in bonis operibus post propriam voluntatem Dei nos niti auxillio, in malis diaboli.*[12]

"The willing and the running belong to us," Jerome continued, "but the success of that willing and running pertain to the mercy of God; thus, as far as the willing and running are concerned, human freedom is preserved whole, while the success of the willing and the running is left to the power of God" --- *et in cursu, liberum servetur arbitrium, et consummatione voluntatis et cursus, Dei cuncta potentiae relinquantur.*[13]

Certainly, "the vessel cannot say to the potter: why have you made me for this or that purpose" (Rom. 9:21); nevertheless, St Paul has urged us "to strive after greater gifts" so "that we may earn rewards for our faith and industry..."[14] Necessarily, then, "we say that holy men are righteous and pleasing to God even after their sins, not only through merits, but through the mercy of God to which the creature is subject and has need."[15] His mercy is the grace He

offers to all and which, if accepted, "crowns our will" --- *coronet in nobis.*[16]

Without grace we can do nothing to attain salvation, "for we are liable for what our ancient forefather, Adam, has done and what we have done" --- *caeterum omnes, aut antiqui propagatoris Adam, aut suo nomine tenentur obnoxii.* Only in Baptism are we liberated from the sins that enslave us, that is, "The blood of Christ frees us" --- *Christi sanguine liberatur.*[17] As the "sin" of our first parents have brought us to this dreadful state, so Christ frees us from it.

g. SAINT AMBROSE OF MILAN (340-397) was no forerunner of Augustine. There was little personal communication between them. Nevertheless, he may have heard the great hierarch preach about "an inherited noxious condition" --- *noxiae conditionis hereditas.* Perhaps, Augustine heard a Holy Week sermon in which Ambrose employed the expression *hereditaria peccata* (plural). "Peter was clean," exclaimed the Saint, "but he should have washed his feet, for he had the sin of the first man by succession, when the serpent overthrew him and persuaded him to err. So his feet are washed [by Christ] that the hereditary sins may be removed; for our sins are remitted by Baptism."[18]

What does Ambrose imply by the words, "the sin of the first man by succession"? Each person shares in the fate of Adam by virtue of his kinship to the first man. We are guilty of the sins we commit, because, like him and on account of him, we violate God's Will. "In Adam I fell," says Ambrose, "and in Adam I was cast out of Paradise. In Adam I died. How shall God call me back, except He find me in the second Adam --- justified in Christ, even as in the first Adam I was

enslaved to death and guilt."[19] In other words, as all exist in Adam, all perish in him --- *Fuit Adam, et in illo fuimus omnes. Periit, et in illo omnes perierunt.*[20]

Put another way,

> Our iniquity is one thing, the other our heel wherein Adam was wounded by the tooth of the serpent, a wound bequeathed to all of Adam's issue, a wound by which we all go limping... this iniquity of my heel surrounds me, but this is Adam's iniquity not mine...[21]

We do not inherit the "guilt" of Adam. Human beings are victims of Adam's sin, not the bearers of it. We inherit not his sin, but "the propensity to sin" (*lubricum delinquendi*). Thus, man's freedom, although restricted by his corruption --- a corruption sewn into the fabric of human nature --- is not abolished. Like all the Fathers before and after him, Ambrose taught that the human will, unable to achieve salvation without divine grace, yet has the power to accept or reject God's assistance.

> Redemption is given gratuitously...not according to merit or virtues or works of justification, but according to the liberality of the Giver and the election of the Redeemer...Why, then, did some of the Israelites attain thereto and others not?... The elect attained to salvation because they heard Him who called them, because they received Him Who came to them.[22]

In another passage, the Bishop of Milan maintains that God must show man the way of salvation. He must go before the sinner to light his path.[23] "Everywhere the power of the Lord cooperates with human endeavors" --- *ubique Domini virtus studiis cooperatur humanis*[24] --- so that "no one can build without the Lord, no one can persevere without the Lord, no one can begin without Him" --- *ut nemo possit aedificare sine Domino, nemo custodire sine Domino, nemo quidquam sine incipere Domino.*[25]

There is no salvation without God: He invites, He leads, He pushes, but man must respond. In other terms, Ambrose's synergy abrogates the entire monergistic syndrome; for grace is bestowed upon the zealous and those predestined on the basis of foreseen merits --- *sed quorum merita praescivit eorum praemia praedestinavit.*[26] We will see later on what other matters Ambrose disagreed with Augustine.

h. ST JOHN CASSIAN (360-435) admired Augustine for his defense of the Faith against the Donatists and Manicheans; and he was therefore greatly perplexed at his fall. Cassian's *Collationes Patrum* was an answer to Augustine's monergism, especially as expressed in *De correptione et gratia* about which we have heard so much already.[27] He sensed now in Augustine the spirit of arrogance, preferring his own ideas to the Tradition of the Church.

> And, therefore, it is laid down by all the Catholic Fathers who have taught perfection of the heart (not by the inane dispute of words, but in deeds) that the first stage of the divine Gift is for each person to be inflamed with the desire for everything good; yet in such a way that the choices of free will are open to either side; and that the second stage of divine Grace is relative to the aforementioned practices of piety without prejudice to the options of human will; the third stage also belongs to the Gifts of God, that is, to the increase of the good already achieved and thus also in such a way so as not to surrender our liberty or subject it to some bondage. Nevertheless, the God of all must be held to work in all men, so as to incite, protect and strengthen us without depleting the will He Himself had once given... how God works all things in us while yet ascribing them to free will cannot be fully grasped by the mind of man."[28]

St John draws our attention first to "the perfection of the heart" (*perfectionem cordis*), language which refers to the transformation of the "inner man" through the grace of the Holy Spirit. Moreover, the method by which the "heart" is perfected, by which the human will cooperates with grace, involves self-mortification, prayer, the Mysteries and meditation, that is, a spirituality which leads to the *gnosis* of transcendent truths denied to all "inane speculation." Cassian's phrase *ad plenum humano sensii ac ratione non potest comprehendi* is clearly pointed at the Bishop of Hippo. Augustine's notions about grace and human freedom radically differ from those principles presupposed in the Christian ideal of perfection, as expressed by St John:

> These two, namely, grace and free will,

> although they seem opposed, in fact are complementary, something which may be concluded from the very nature of rational piety. Were we to deny one or the other, we would appear to abandon the Faith of the Church.[29]

From another point of view,

> We may not doubt that every soul innately possesses the seeds of the goodness planted in it by a grace of the Creator. But unless excited to life by His assistance, those seeds will never grow and reach maturity, because, according to St Paul, 'Neither he that plants is anything nor he that waters, but God who gives the increase' (I Cor. 3:7). It is clearly said in the book called *The Shepherd* [of Hermas] that man can freely choose what he pleases. There we read also (Mandat. 6:2) that each person has two angels; and we have the power to choose which of the two we will follow. In this sense, man always keeps his free will: he may choose to neglect or enjoy the grace of God.[30]

If John is correct, writes Professor Norman Williams, then his teaching necessarily "overthrows the whole structure of absolute predestinationism which presupposes both the irresistibility of grace and its arbitrary distribution."[31] The two positions cannot be mediated: either St John Cassian or Augustine rightly witnessed to the Faith of the Church.

i. ST PAULINUS OF NOLA (353-431) greatly revered Augustine. He first learned of "holy brother

Augustine" through his anti-Manichean writings. Paulinus may also have read *De vera religione* and a book he described as "about the Pentateuch." They exchanged many letters, of which only three are extant.[32]

Yet, despite his stated admiration for the Bishop of Hippo, his writings show not the slightest theological influence of Augustine. For example, St Paulinus places the devil conspicuously at the center of his soteriology. "The devil claimed the entire offspring of Adam through the laws of death," he wrote to Severus (*Ep.* XXIII, 15). Moreover, we exchange slavery for freedom, St Paulinus declares, when we have "redirected our freedom and our slavery for the better... We break the bonds of wickedness by submitting to another yoke, which are the reins of the fear of God" (*Ep.* XXIV, 12).

We can never escape the power of the devil and "the death he weaves" without grace. The first step towards liberation is "the holy bath which renews life and blots out former misdeeds" (*Poem* XXIII, 309). In Christ, through Baptism, "death has no power to plant Christians among the dead" (*Poem* XXIV, 150); for with "the holy bath," we have "stripped off Adam and are moving towards the shape of angels" (*Poem* XXV, 167). The body of "the new man" "is governed neither by sin, nor sin by death, nor death by the devil" (*Poem.* XXXI, 69).

Thus, by His Redemption, "the good Lord" has "annihilated death in us and restored immortality," and He has also fashioned this present life so that we might obtain the merit through which we earn the eternal life of blessedness" (*Ep.* XII, 6). "Grace and glory to Him Who does not abandon the works of His

Hands," Paulinus exclaimed, "and 'will have all men to be saved and come to the knowledge of the truth' (I Tim. 2:4). Hastening over the world 'with feet that bring good tidings' (Isa. 52:7), He wished to make you a splendid thigh to bear His sword..." (*Ep.* XVIII, 6).

Undoubtedly, St Paulinus explained to Severus, the "earthly corruption," "that ancestral venom descended from Adam, infecting the whole human race, remains in me" (*Ep.* XXX, 2); but "God was in Christ reconciling the world to Himself" (II Cor. 5:19). Only the Incarnate Lord "could prevail against the sentence of death and 'the sting of sin' to 'blot out the handwriting' (Col. 2:14) of death and to humble the crafty one" (*Ep.* XXIII, 5).

With his stress on the antagonism between Christ and the devil, the purpose of the divine Economy is placed in the right perspective. God became man to rescue the creature from the power of the devil who controls humanity through death whose "sting" is sin. Death is Adam's legacy; but Christ has overcome the evil one and given to the human race the grace by which to attain eternal life.

j. Another contemporary of Augustine was ST PETER CHRYSOLOGUS (c. 404-450), ARCHBISHOP OF RAVENNA. He seems to have had knowledge of the Pelagian controversy and, therefore, his sermons reflected his concern. Sermons to his people involved the soteriological questions which the controversy raised.

St Peter believed that "Christ was born that by His birth, He might renew our corrupted nature" --- *Nacitur Christus, ut nascendo corruptam redintegret naturam.*[33] Thus, "he who lives is indebted to Christ, not to himself; and he who dies is indebted to Adam" --- *quia qui vivit, Christo debet non sibi: et Adam quod moritur id debebit.*[34] Death is the penalty for Adam's sin, which flows out to all Adam's posterity.[35] "Sin entered the world under the control of death" --- *et per peccatum intrasse videmur in mortem.*[36]

Both death and its "sting," sin, are manipulated by the devil. Thus, "captured by the devil, the author of death, Christ Himself conquered; although slain, He Himself punished; although dying for the sheep, He opened for them the way to conquer death" --- *ut auctorem mortis diabolum novo ordine captus caperet, victus vinceret; puniret occisus, et ovibus moriendo, viam vincendae mortis aperiret.*[37] Consequently, those who belong to Christ, those who live the life of mortification, of prayer, almsgiving, love, etc., not only secure a position in heaven,[38] but "enter into a share of His Divinity along with the transformed world" --- *terra transferetur in coelum, homo deitate mutatur.*[39]

The "transformation" was initiated in the Resurrection of Christ.[40] The effects of it are demonstrated in the life of the righteous man; but, at the same time, righteousness is achieved by hard labor --- *quid nobis virtutum iter arduum, quid durus otinendae justitae labor.*[41] In a typical aphorism, St Peter says, "Man pleases God not by living, but by living well" --- *Quia non homo ex eo quod vivet placet, sed placet ex eo quod bene vivit.*[42] "Living well" surely implies living in grace, a grace which facilitates the right choices.

Grace may be lost through pride or fornication or heresy. Grace may be acquired through works of mercy and worship and true faith. A "theology of salvation" by the secret and arbitrary counsel of God is missing from the books and sermons of St Peter Chrysologus.

k. ST VALERIAN (439-460), BISHOP OF CIMIEZ, a hierarch of southern Gaul, is another Father of the West who taught that "the religion named Christian, to which we have been called, is a duty undertaken by free will" --- *Religio christiani nominis in quia vocati sumus, liberi arbitrii suscepit officium.*[43] Spiritual progress demands grace and there can be none without it, but "the hope of obtaining glory consists in struggle... There is nothing which struggle does not overcome" --- *et spem obtinendae gloriae in labore consistere... Nihil est enim quod non labor exsuperet.*[44] The struggle is against "the devil, the author of death" --- *diabolus, auctor mortis* --- but it is a struggle that we do not undertake alone. "When God our Saviour assists us," writes St Valerian, "the devil's power of dominion is undoubtedly absent" --- *Assistente igitur Deo ac Salvatore nostro, sine dubio dominatione diabolicae potestatis absentat.*[45] Moreover, "the Lord never abandons a person steadfastly and freely devoted to religion" --- *Nuncum enim deserit Dominus voluntatem religionis studio florentem.*[46] Steadfastness in grace is secured by humility. As St Valerian asserts:

> Most precious, so that you will not lose the grace promised as the gift of our reward, we love and seek and choose and hold fast to humility or, as the Evangelist Luke says, 'He who humbles himself shall be exalted, but he who exalts himself shall be humbled'... A humble man will go from a lower to a higher state, rewarded finally with the fitting power as he gains the grace of heavenly power.[47]

Finally, the Saint reminds Christians that "whatever grace a man acquires over many years through works of righteousness, may be lost over the space of one hour through lapsing into a life of turpitude" --- *Perit profecto quidquid gratiae homo per multos annos justis operibus acquisivit, si sub unius horae spatio quocumque turpis vitae depravetur errore.*[48]

i. Contrary to F. Cayre,[49] Augustine's idea of irresistible grace did not "show" any better in the writings of POPE ST LEO THE GREAT, BISHOP OF ROME (d. 461) than his contemporaries. We ought not be misled by St Leo's vocabulary. The mind of Augustine did not rule the thinking of this Pope. Thus, when asked, *cur Deus homo*? St Leo replied:

> But unless the Almighty God did deign to do this [i.e., become man], no kind of righteousness, no form of wisdom could rescue us from the devil's bondage and from the depths of eternal death. For the condemnation passes from one [Adam] to all. Sin would have remained and our nature corroded by that lethal force [death], with no remedy available to us; for we cannot alter our condition by our own strength.[50]

Such would not have been our fate had Adam persevered in "the high calling of his nature," but he acceded to "the presumptuous counsels of the devil, so that now he [Adam] and all those after him hear the verdict: 'dust thou art and to dust shalt thou return.'" Adam lost "immortality" and "celestiality" for all --- *et nemo immortalis, quia nemo coelestis.*[51]

Adam's children, on account of the "original sin,"

have been hostage to the devil; but Leo declares, "in the offspring of the holy Virgin a blessed seed was produced that frees us from the vitiation of his [Adam] stock."[52] Palpably, then, "we could not have been released from the chains of eternal death (*aeternae mortis vinculis*), save by Him Who humbled Himself to our nature, albeit He remained Almighty in Himself." He, Christ, came and abolished "the contagion of carnal birth" [death], regenerating us anew "without Himself standing accused."[53]

But Christ does not work alone. We augment the gift of God with our labors --- *ut etiam labore proprio quaeret augmentum* --- although, Saint Leo adds, "grace incites us to work freely and harmoniously with it" --- *et per spiritum gratiae ut voluntare in unam compagem congruat incitatur.*[54] Indeed, we share in overcoming the *vitiis pares*. Nevertheless, as the Lord told His disciples, "Without me you can do nothing" (John 15:5), that is, "we cannot accomplish or even initiate any good without the divine Agency" --- *non est hominum bona agentem ex Deo habere et effectum operis et initium voluntatis*; we cannot obtain "the property of Divinity without Him" --- *nec proprietatem obtinet Deitatis.*[55]

m. The renewal of Western monasticism begins with ST BENEDICT OF NURSIA (480-544). His monachism was formed by *The Paradise of the Fathers, Sayings of the Fathers, Histories of the Hermits of the Egyptian Desert, Questions and Answers of Holy Men*; but he "drew largely" on St John Cassian's *Conferences* and *Institutes* which his monks were required to read every day.[56] In his own *Rule*, Benedict mentioned, other than Cassian, only "our holy Father Basil" (of Caesarea) by name. If it is true, as some have said, that he read

several of Augustine's commentaries on the Psalms and a few of his letters, and perhaps, too, the *Rule* of Caesarius of Arles, his interest in them was ascetical, not doctrinal.

Benedict counseled his monks that "perfect religion" was achieved by reading "the holy Fathers" and the divine Scriptures. His attitude towards grace and free will (and by implication, predestination) was intimated in the prologue of his *Rule*:

> Hearken, O my son, to the precepts of your Master, and incline the ear of your heart. Willingly receive and faithfully fulfill the admonition of your loving father...return by the labor of obedience... Renouncing your own will, take up the strong and bright weapon of obedience in order to fight for the Lord Christ, our true king...whatever good work you begin to do, beg of Him with most earnest prayer to perfect it... That not only may He never, as an angry father, disinherit His children... but let us ask God to supply by the help of His grace what is not possible for us.[57]

The *raison d'etre* of monasticism, as the 72 chapters of Benedict's *Rule* indicate, is the transformation of human nature through obedience, humility and the mortification of the flesh (*RB* I, 5-7). We do not find in his *Regula*, as we do in the "monasticism" of Augustine, an intellectualization and "interiorization of Christianity."[58]

n. Finally, let us examine the soteriology of POPE ST GREGORY THE GREAT (540-604), BISHOP OF ROME and

votary of St Benedict. On the basis of the not uncommon prejudice that this holy Father was "Augustinian," we naturally ask whether the opinion is justified. Was St Gregory a monergist and predestinarian? Did he espouse Augustine's doctrine of "original sin" and "irresistible grace"?

According to St Gregory, "the ancient enemy" is the devil. "It is known, most dear brother in Christ," he wrote Bishop Columbus, "that the ancient enemy, who by cunning persuasion deposed the first man from the delights of Paradise, to this life of care, inflicted on the human race the penalty of mortality" --- *etiam eo iam tunc humano generi poenam mortalis inflixit.*[59]

Adam's folly delivered man to the "ancient enemy" through death and corruption. Yet, his debilitated will does not prevent him from cooperating with God's salvific grace. In his *Moralia, On the Book of Job*, St Gregory exclaims:

> And whereas that grace follows our will, Paul adds, 'And His grace which was bestowed upon me was not in vain, for I labored more abundantly than all'; and who, knowing that he was nothing in himself, says, 'Yet not I,' meaning that he was something only in union with grace, the Apostle adds, 'but the grace of God with me.' He would not have said, 'with me' if together with prevenient grace, he had not the free will to follow it. Therefore, in order to show that he was nothing without grace, Paul says, 'Yet not I,' to show that along with grace, he had acted with free will; hence, the words, 'but the grace of God with me.'[60]

In the same work, the Pope states,

> Because when divine grace goes before us in good works, our free will follows it, we who yield consent to God Who delivers us, are said to deliver ourselves... For since he [Paul] freely followed prevenient grace, he properly adds, 'with me,' that he might neither be unthankful for the divine gift, while also not remaining a stranger to the merit of free will.[61]

Augustinian vocabulary is evident, but not his soteriology. St Gregory did not regard the moment of conversion to be the moment when the human will is drawn irresistibly to God. The Pope often speaks of man rejecting the divine grace.[62]

Therefore, he embraced the traditional understanding of predestination --- *praedestinatio ex previsi meritis.* God elects those whom he foreknew would persist in works of faith and goodness --- *electos nominat [Deus] quia cernit quod in fide et bono opere persistat.*[63] "Predestination to the eternal kingdom is so disposed by Almighty God," says Gregory, "that His elect attain to it by labour and prayers, meriting that which God has before the ages predetermined to give them" --- *Nam ipsa quoque perennis regni praedestinatio ita est ab omnipotenti Deo disposita, ut ad hoc electi ex labore preveniant, quatenus postulando mereantur accipere quod eis omnipotens Deus ante saecula disposuit donare.*[64]

God reprobates only those who will not repent, that is, those who make no serious attempt to withdraw from the power of the devil, but rather consent to his

guile.[65] Also, God does not compel us to convert; nor is He obliged to preserve us in a state of grace: once saved is not always saved. Grace may act upon us to believe and to act rightly and to continue in "the gift of immortal grace" (*immortalis gratiae donum*), but grace is a gift that may be lost. "Let us tremble at the blessing we have received," exhorts St Gregory. "We know what we are today, but we know not what may become of us in the future."[66]

God may withdraw His grace from us "to show the presumptuous mind how weak it is";[67] or, as in the case of Pharaoh, He might "harden the heart" which, according to St Gregory, "God is said to 'harden' in executing justice, that is, when He does not soften the reprobate heart with the gift of grace; thus, He 'shuts up' the man whom He abandons to the darkness of his own evil practices."[68] We will see later how Augustine treats the story of Pharaoh's "hard heart."

o. The position of ST FAUSTUS (d. 485), BISHOP OF RIEZ, has already been discussed in considerable detail elsewhere.

2. The Fathers of the East

In the writings of the East Roman Fathers and the liturgical books of the Orthodox Church, the words "love," "mercy," "glory," even "salvation" are synonyms for grace. Also, we find such expressions as "the grace of creation," "the grace of paradise," "the grace of the Law," "the grace of miracles," "the grace of truth," etc. The many senses of the word "grace" are everywhere in patristic literature, whether in the East or the West. The rationalist's need to classify moments of grace is missing in the early Church.[69]

The Eastern Fathers, with their cosmological approach to the Christian revelation, said much about grace as the ground of existence.[70] Grace is not only the very "energy" of spiritual life, but all life. Grace accounts for the goodness and truth among the Jews and Gentiles. Nothing of value is achieved without it; nothing endures without it. Grace is not only the grace of salvation, but of creation and of providence.

a. The soteriology observed already in the Western Fathers is present in the writings of the sub-Apostolic doctors of the Orthodox Church. ST IGNATIOS (d. 110), BISHOP OF ANTIOCH, disciple of St John the Theologian, maintains, "What has been prepared in Christ by God, had a beginning. And because of the Plan for the abolition of death, all things have been disturbed."[71] Before His Coming, the world lay in the throes of corruption (φθορα), and in the clutches of the devil, under the rule of death. The end of things is judgment; therefore, Ignatios warned Christians to fear "the wrath to come" and to "love the grace we have" (*Ad Eph.*, 11).

b. ST BARNABAS (1st c.) and ST POLYCARP (70-156), BISHOP OF SMYRNA, like ST THEOPHILOS (d. 180), BISHOP OF ANTIOCH, taught the universality of sin and death. Man, says Theophilos, was made neither mortal nor immortal, but he would have gained the immortality "by keeping the commandments of God"; but when Adam fell, we all fell, even as when the master of the house sins, "servants also suffer" (*Ad Autoly.* II, 17).

c. ST JUSTIN MARTYR (c. 110-c. 165) preached the same. When Adam fell, he wrote, he put himself and his posterity under a curse (ὑπ' κατάραν): death. If Adam

had kept the commandment of God, he and the entire human race would have partaken of immortality (*Dial. c. Tryph.*, 95).[72] Instead, man is mortal and "persecuted" by the devil (*Ora. ad Graec.*, 28). Nevertheless, human beings have retained the faculty to "freely shun evil and do good... [otherwise] he is not responsible for his actions... only by free will does man act rightly or do wrong..." (*I Apol.*, 43).

d. ST ATHANASIOS THE GREAT (295-373) was not alone, among the Alexandrian Fathers, in upholding the traditional soteriology of the Church.[73] "Wherefore, children, let us hold fast our discipline (ἀσκήσεως)," he once said, "and not be careless; for the Lord is our fellow-worker, as it is written, 'to all that choose good, God is with them for the good'" --- συνεργεῖ ὁ θεὸς εἰς τὸ ἀγαθόν.[74] God is with us and "whatever else may perish, the grace of the Maker will never perish."[75]

Once we were dead in Adam, Athanasios explained, but no longer; now we are alive in Christ, a life provided by the Lord's Resurrection. We must struggle to perfect and preserve that life, "to keep pace with the grace of God and not fall short; lest while our will is idle, the grace we have been given should be lost; and the enemy, finding us empty and naked, should enter in..." and recapture us. "For if a person despises the grace given to him, he forthwith falls into the cares of the world and delivers himself to its lusts..."[76] Otherwise, as the parable of the talents proves, grace increases with effort.[77]

e. ST MAKARIOS THE GREAT (300-390) taught that man has the freedom to make himself "a vessel of the devil" or "a vessel of election and life." Even those "who have drunk Divinity [i.e., grace], though

fulfilled and upheld by the Holy Spirit, yet are constrained by no necessity, having rather the freedom to do as they wish in this world."[78] We act as we will, because grace does not overwhelm us; it acts "impulsively" on our nature, a nature which is free and independent --- καὶ θεία χάρις προτρεπτική ἐστι διὰ τὸ αὐτεξούσιον καὶ λιτὸν τῆς φύσεως. A person becomes evil by his own will and good in the same way, St Makarios added. If he turns to the good and struggles to persist in it, accordingly God repays him with grace and glorifies him --- ὁμοίως καὶ ἐὰν τραπῇ ὁ ἄνθρωπος εἰς τὸ ἀγαθόν, καί περιγένοιτο χάρις θεοῦ, οὐκ ἐπιγράφει τὸ ἀγαθὸν ἑαυτῇ ἡ χάρις, ἀλλ' ἀποδίδωσι τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ καὶ δοξάζει αὐτόν.[79]

Again, the good that comes by grace is far superior to the good achieved by the Gentiles. "In the servants of God wherein grace abounds," he writes, "sinful desires wither, for they evaporate in a nature superior to the first Adam...superior, because it is deified" --- ἔρχεται εἰς τὰ μέτρα τοῦ πρώτου Ἀδάμ, καὶ μείζων αὐτοῦ γίγνεται. Αποθεουται γαρ ο ανθρωπος.[80] In a word, deification is the process and power of grace to transfigure the person who has chosen to do the Will of God.

f. ST CYRIL (c. 377-444), BISHOP OF ALEXANDRIA testifies to the Christian soteriology nowhere better than in his *Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*. The verse so dear to Augustine (Rom. 8:28),[81] κλητοὶ γεγόνασι τινες κατὰ πρόθεσιν, τήν τε τοῦ κεκληκότος καὶ τὴν ἑαυτῶν is exegeted in typical patristic manner by St Cyril. For him the word προθεσις (purpose) is a synonym for βούλησις (a willingness). "The many" are "the called" according to "the purpose," a "purpose which not all accept," for "the many [everyone] is

called but few are chosen."[82]

Behind this doctrine was Cyril's attitude towards the fallen human race. He confessed that all men die in Adam whereas all rise in Christ. We are made alive in Him through the Mystery of Baptism, whereby the initiated are organically united to Him. But how is it that all men die in Adam?

> He heard 'earth thou art and to earth shalt thou return,' that is, incorrupt he became corrupt (καὶ φθαρτὸς ἐξ ἀφθάρτου γέγονε) and made subject to the bonds of death. Since he produced children in this fallen state, we, his descendants, are corruptible, as coming from a corrupt source. Thus we are the heirs of Adam's curse. This does not mean that all are punished for Adam's disobedience to the divine commandment he received; but rather that he became mortal, as I said, and transmitted the curse to his seed after him --- for we are born of mortal substance --- whereas our Lord Jesus Christ (He Who is the 'second Adam') is a new beginning of our race, re-forming us unto incorruptibility by assaulting death, and nullifying the first curse through His own flesh. This is why the all-wise Paul said, 'through man came death, so also through man has come the resurrection of the dead;' and again, 'As in Adam all die, so in Christ shall all be made alive.' Hence, corruption and death are the universal and general consequences of Adam's transgression; likewise, the universal and general ransom has been accomplished finally in Christ... All are released by Christ

> from the primal penalty, the penalty of death, the death which reaches all in its course, in resemblance of the first man who fell into death. For this reason the all-wise Paul asserts, 'Death ruled from Adam to Moses over those who had sinned in the likeness of Adam's transgression.' Under the law, then, death reigned, but with the Advent of Christ came the righteousness of grace whereby our bodies were cleansed from corruption.[83]

Noticeable in this paragraph is Cyril's stress on inherited death and corruption, not inherited guilt. Rather the "penalty" or "curse" is "corruption," that is, the decay of our nature on account of death. Escape from the "curse" is transformation by Christ: in the new and immaculate substance of the Incarnate Lord. His grace offers human perfection and immortality.

g. Regarding Romans 8:28-30, ST JOHN CHRYSOSTOM (344-407), BISHOP OF CONSTANTINOPLE, says little more. He concurs that everyone is "called," but "few are chosen." They are not "chosen" because they do not follow God's "purpose." The word "purpose" is employed here by the Apostle, writes St John, "so that not everything might be ascribed to the 'calling;' for otherwise both the Greeks and Jews would gainsay; and if the 'calling' were sufficient, why is not everyone saved? Thus, Paul says that it was not the 'calling' alone, but the 'purpose' of them that are called that works for salvation." "All are called, but not all obeyed the call. For the calling was not forced upon them, nor were they compelled to come; nevertheless, "all are called, but not all obeyed the call" --- οὐ γὰρ ἠναγκασμένη γέγονεν ἡ κλῆσις οὐδὲ βεβιασμένη.

Πάντες γοῦν ἐκλθήσαν, ἀλλ' οὐ πάντες ὑπήκουσαν.[84]

Moreover, we are "justified" διὰ τοῦ λουτροῦ παλλιγγενεσίας; and "adopted" or "glorified" διὰ χάριτος υἱοθεσίας.[85] "Rebirth" and "sonship" come by the grace of Baptism: the same grace which sets our feet on the road of salvation. It is the grace of the Holy Spirit.

> How does grace come to be 'with us?' if we are insolent to the energy (εἰς τὴν ἐνεργειάν), if we are indifferent to the gift. And what is grace, he asks? The remission of sins, the cleansing: this is 'with us.' Who is able to treat grace with insolence and not lose it? God freely forgave our sins. How shall grace be 'with you,' that is, as the good pleasure or energy of the Spirit (ἡ τοῦ Πνεῦμα ἐνεργεία)? You draw grace to you by good works; indeed, the cause of every good thing is this: the enduring grace of the Spirit within us. He leads us to every good work, all righteousness, even as His absence leaves us desolate and in ruins.[86]

The "good works" to which Chrysostom refers are not "the works of the Law," but the "good works" of saving grace, the grace of the Spirit, the boundless grace which advances us onward toward higher and more spiritual things.[87]

How and why does grace act in us? The answer presupposes what the Scriptures describe as "the economy of salvation" in which God "gathers together in one [man] all things in Christ" (Eph. 1:10). Thus, those who are baptized form "one man" in Christ Who is

the temple of the Holy Spirit. In Them, wrote St John Chrysostom, the "adopted," the "justified" --- the members of the Church, the Body of Christ --- gain not only the forgiveness of sins, but "stand" in the grace wherein is produced good works unto perfection and immortality.

This very end was lost to Adam when he disobeyed God and brought instead death and corruption to all his posterity. He became, then, the very antitype of Christ. How is Adam the antitype of the Lord? "In that as the former became to them who spring from him (although they had not eaten from the tree) the cause of death which he introduced by eating [i.e. disobedience]. Christ, on the other hand, did righteously bestow life on all who spring from Him, even though they were not responsible for the righteousness wrought by the Cross."[88]

Thus, as the sin of Adam has wrought our death and condemnation, the grace of Christ has abolished not only that first sin but all its consequences --- ὅτι τὸν μὲν θάνατον καὶ τὸ κατακρίμα ἰσχυσεν ἁμαρτία μία εἰσενεγκεῖν· ἡ δὲ χάρις οὐ τὴν μίαν ἐκείνην ἁμαρτία ἀνεῖλε μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰς μετ' ἐκείνην ἐπεισελθουσας.[89] Although Adam died because he sinned, we sin because we die. Human sin is the manifestation and the ratification of our mortal nature.

Nothing better reveals our mortality and sinfulness than the many bodily passions, "for when the body became mortal, it necessarily welcomed concupiscence, anger, grief, and all the other passions which require much philosophy to prevent the foundering and sinking of our reasoning powers into the depths of sin" --- ἃ πολλῆς ἐδείτο φιλοσοφίας, ἵνα με πλημμύραντα ἐν ἡμῖν καταποντίστη τὸν λογισμὸν εἰς τὸν τὴς ἁμαρτίας

βυθόν.[90]

The "philosophy" of which St John spoke is asceticism --- which incidentally is not limited to monks. He mentioned "reasoning powers" with regard to it, because reason (διανοία) in Christian spirituality is the "sentinel" of the "mind" (νους), the faculty which distinguishes between good and evil in the fight against the devil and the passions with which he hopes to blacken the "heart" (καρδία) or the "inner self" through which the believer "sees" God.[91]

h. The so-called Cappadocian Fathers --- ST BASIL THE GREAT (330-379), BISHOP OF CAESAREA, ST GREGORY THE THEOLOGIAN, BISHOP OF NAZIANZUS (328-390) and ST GREGORY (335-394?), BISHOP OF NYSSA --- take predictable positions on the matters of grace, free will and predestination. For example, St Basil declared,

> Men's good enterprises will never be accomplished without help from above; but the heavenly grace does not descend upon him who has no zeal. In a word, it is necessary for the realization of perfect virtue for both these elements to be present: the human zeal and the assistance descending from above according to our faith.[92]

The "perfection" to which God brings us is "the first grace from which we were alienated by sin,"[93] that is, the "first grace" is the grace of perfect fellowship (κοινωνία) with God, that "original beauty" which the innocent Adam enjoyed with God in Paradise.

St Basil's witness to the traditional doctrine of Divine-human cooperation was repeated by St Gregory the

Theologian. Salvation, he said, depends on ourselves as well as God --- ὅτι καὶ τὸ βούλεσθαι καλῶς, δεῖται τῆς παρὰ θεοῦ βοηθείας· μᾶλλον δὲ αὐτὸ τὸ προαιρεῖσθαι τὰ δέοντα, θεῖον τι καὶ ἐκ θεοῦ δῶρον φιλανθρωπίας· δεῖ γὰρ καὶ τὸ ἐφ' ἡμῖν εἶναι τὸ ἐκ θεοῦ σώζεσθαι.[94] Furthermore, he exclaimed, "I do not know which to praise more: the grace which called him [his father] or his choice of it... He belonged to those who anticipate faith by their disposition and, possessing the thing itself, lack only the name... he received faith itself as a reward of virtue."[95]

Lest we misunderstand the Theologian, let us recall that he once said, "Without Christ a mortal is unable to lift his foot."[96] On more than one occasion, Gregory affirmed that God blesses humanity with many graces, found everywhere: the grace of nature, the grace of providence, the grace of prophecy, the grace of the Mysteries, the grace of gifts as well as the grace of perfection. However, only the members of Christ may have the grace whereby they achieve dispassion and the salvation which deifies them.[97]

Not unlike his brother and his friend, St Gregory of Nyssa taught, "As the grace of God cannot visit the souls of those who evade salvation, so the power of human virtue is not in itself sufficient for the uplifting of souls which fail to participate in the grace of perfection."[98] Salvation, moreover, is the gift of God, but "faith resides within the will" --- ἡ μὲν ἐντὸς τῆς προαιρέσεως ἡμῶν ἀποκειμένη.[99] Every grace is "the grace of the Holy Spirit" which, among other things, inspired David the King and "regenerates the people" and imparted the power of the resurrection to the Apostles.[100]

Listen to what St Gregory recorded concerning "the

grace of the resurrection," "the grace of redemption" in the prayer of his sister, St Makrina,

> Thou hast restored again what Thou hadst given, transforming with incorruptibility and grace what is mortal and shameful in us. Thou hast redeemed us from the curse and sin, having become both on our behalf. Thou hast crushed the head of the serpent... and negated the one who had power over us through death...[101]

Grace is divine energy (θείας ἐνεργείας), according to St Gregory, a power by which our mortal nature is transformed; it is not compulsory. It will flee (φευγούσαις) the soul which does not want salvation. Grace acts with the human will in its struggle for perfection. Predestination is the result of God's foreknowledge of human effort.

i. If we examine a small treatise by ST GERMANOS (635-733), BISHOP OF CONSTANTINOPLE entitled *Concerning the Boundaries of Life*, or sometimes, *On the Predestined Terms of Life*,[102] we find a typical patristic treatment of "predestination." He made no mention of Augustine and, judging from the Patriarch's analysis, he had no knowledge of him.

St Germanos attempts in *Boundaries* to answer the question --- which he lamented had not been given much attention by theologians --- whether God has predetermined the end of each person's life. He responds that "the death of each person occurs when the terms of his life have been fulfilled, an end fixed by the just decision of God Who foresees far ahead what is in our best interest" --- θάνατοι ἐπάγονται τῶν ὅρων τῆς ζωῆς πληρωθέντων, οὓς περὶ ἕκαστον ἔπηξεν ἡ δικαία

τοῦ θεοῦ κρίσις πορρώθεν τὸ περὶ ἡμᾶς συμφέρον προβλεπομένου.[103]

If God has "predestined" the end of every person's life, does it mean, then, that each detail which brings him to that end is predetermined? Germanos replied that by God's own "prognostic power," He considers beforehand the ways in which things will be realized and by His just decision predestined their end "in the most appropriate way" --- καὶ τε οἰκεία προγνωστικῇ δυνάμει προθεωροῦντος τὰς ἐκβάσεις τῶν ἐσομένων καὶ καταλλήλως τούτοις τε δικαία αὐτοῦ κρίσει τὰ τέλη τοὺτων προορίζοντος.[104] The phrase "the most appropriate way" is the key to the Saint's thinking. He quoted St Gregory the Wonderworker: God "rules the world but considers our free will" --- νομοθετοῦντος τὸ αὐτεξούσιον --- meaning that God's foreknowledge is not predeterminative --- οὐ ταὐτον ὅρος καὶ πρόγνωσις.[105]

Of course, God knows all things "before" they happen; and He knows "in a divine and ineffable way" what they are and when they will be. He "foresees the future, as if it were before His eyes." In a manner befitting His foreknowledge, God places His peculiar predestinational judgment upon those events --- αὐτὸς γὰρ εἰδὼς τὰ πάντα πρὶν γενέσεως αὐτῶν οὐδὲ ἐκ τεκμηρίων στοιχαζόμενος τὸ ἐσόμενον, ἀλλὰ δυνάμει θεοπρεπεῖ καὶ ἀρρήτων τῇ τῶν γεγησομένων ἐπιβάλλων ἐκβάσει, καὶ ὑπ' ὄψιν, ὡς εἰπεῖν τὰ μέλλοντα προορώμενος, προσφόρως τοῖς προεωραμένοις αὐτῷ καὶ τὰ τῆς ἑαύτου κρίσεως ἐπ' αὐτοῖς προορίζει.[106]

What God knows, He knows in His own way; and He predestines what He has foreseen in His own incomprehensible manner. Germanos had no philosophical doctrine to explain the divine epistemology --- no *analogia entis* and no supercosmic Ideas --- for God is

beyond being (ὑπερούσιος). He has His own way of knowing and nothing can be compared with it; and His knowing with regard to human freedom does not bear the force of necessity. Although "He enacts and enjoins the things that lead to virtue while restraining evil," averred the Saint, "His foreknowledge is not hindered by them, nor prevents Him from executing wise and righteous judgments on account of them; and thus, in the words of the Apostles, 'those whom He foreknew, He predestinated' (Rom. 8:29)."[107]

Finally, what we know of God has been revealed; and the understanding of what has been revealed belongs to the Church's divinely-guided Tradition; hence, the references in *Boundaries* only to the Scriptures, St Basil, St Gregory of Nyssa, St Athanasios, etc.[108] No deference of any kind is shown to pagan philosophy.

j. *De Fide Orthodoxa* by ST JOHN OF DAMASCOS (700-750) is a summary of the patristic witness to virtually every "theological" and "economic" topic discussed in the Church hitherto. Notable is the fact that among the West Roman Fathers, John cited Sts Cyprian, Ambrose and Jerome, but not Augustine --- not here and not anywhere in his writings.

Following the patristic tradition, St John taught that death had "its origin in Adam's transgression."[109] Our first father, "freely neglecting the divine injunction was subject to death and corruption"; and "was firmly established in wickedness, so that there was no room for repentance and no hope for change; just as, moreover, the angels, when they had voluntarily chosen virtue became through grace immovably rooted in goodness." From the time of Adam to Christ, the human race has been "subject to passion instead of dispassion, mortality instead of immortality."[110]

Nevertheless, every person has retained the power to choose between good and evil, although, to be sure, no purely human choice could bring perfection and deification which became possible only with the Incarnation. For if we had no choice, then, neither would we deserve praise or blame; nor would we be rational, for the faculty of deliberation would then be "superfluous" and "of what use is that faculty if man were not master of his own actions? To prove that the fairest and most precious of man's endowments is superfluous would be the height of absurdity."[111]

At the same time, sinful and mortal man's freedom is not absolute; and "without God's cooperation and help we can do nothing worthy of salvation," the Damascene maintained. "Yet, it is within our power to abide in virtue and follow God" or "to stray from the path of virtue, dwelling in wickedness, following the summons of the devil who in fact cannot force us."[112]

If the devil cannot force us to do evil, God will not compel us to do good. His foreknowledge does not ignore our freedom and, therefore, is not coercive.

> We must understand that while God knows all things beforehand, yet He does not predetermine them. He knows in advance those things that will be placed in our power and does not predetermine them. For it is not His Will that there should be wickedness nor does He choose to compel virtue. So that predetermination is the work of the divine command based on foreknowledge. But, on the other hand, God predetermines those things which are not within our power in accordance with His prescience. For by His prescience God has already prejudged

all things according to his goodness and justice.[113]

Implicit in St John's theology is an understanding of God, man and free will not found in the thinking of Augustine.

k. Ironically, it was from the Carolingians that ST PHOTIOS THE GREAT (820-891), BISHOP OF CONSTANTINOPLE, learned that Augustine (and ostensibly several West Roman Fathers) taught a heretical triadology. Photios read the Bishop of Hippo in translation (as he did not know Latin) and only excerpts of his writings; and probably only those relative to the controversy with the Franks. It is curious, therefore, that he could maintain that the writings of Augustine had been adulterated. His knowledge of Augustine did not even extend to the important details of the Pelagian controversy about which the Saint knew very little.[114]

Photios' ignorance of the African bishop is best illustrated by his *Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*. We possess only fragments of the work; and, also, his dialogue with Ecumenios on the same epistle (PG 118). These are sufficient for our purpose.

There is a marked difference between Augustine and the Patriarch of Constantinople in their analysis of the Epistle. St Photios gathered from St Paul that the fall of Adam signified "destruction" (ἀπώλεια) and "death" (θάνατος) to the human race. The first man brought mortality upon humanity while Christ, his antitype, wrought "salvation" (σωτηρία) and "life" (ζωη) by His Resurrection --- Ὡς γὰρ ἐκεῖνος [Adam] αἴτιος ἀνθρώποις θανάτου, οὕτως ὁ χριστὸς αἴτιος ἀνθρώποις ἀναστάσεως.[115]

Christ alone provides the "ineffable" grace by which we are saved. It is given, yet it is something to be won (πόρισμα). We are called "according to the intention, according to the purpose of those worthy of election" --- τοῖς κατὰ γνώμην κατὰ πρόθεσιν ἀξιωθεῖσι τῆς κλήσεως.[116] Again, God's decision to call those yet unborn, having done neither good nor evil, indicates "that the calling is the work of Him Who calls, not he who is called." His actions are based on foreknowledge, Photios continued, a foreknowledge of all things that will be, a foreknowledge which does not however write the future. There is indeed a disparity between what God knows and what He does, even though from a human perspective the distinction may not seem important.[117]

God imposes neither salvation nor damnation on us. Thus, in the case of "the obdurate Pharaoh" who would not let Israel go, God caused or occasioned "the hardness of heart," and according to the Saint "I hardened Pharaoh's heart" and "I permitted his heart to be hardened" are the same.[118] St Photios taught, then, that the "hardness of Pharaoh's heart" presupposes some human intent and action. God did not surrender Pharaoh to perdition without his own consent. His fate was sealed by his resistance to the divine Will.

This truth reflects the Saint's general attitude towards Adam's transgression and its consequence for his progeny. Photios asserted that men die because they imitate the disobedience of Adam.[119] His writings offer no theory that every creature issuing from Adam by natural descent is guilty of his sin; and it is doubtful that he knew of any such idea. Considering this fact alone, it is difficult to understand the modern Orthodox apologists who appeal to Photios on

behalf of Augustine.

1. ST GREGORY PALAMAS (1296-1359), ARCHBISHOP OF THESSALONICA was not the first Church Father to describe grace as uncreated. The phrase "operations of God" (e.g., St Clement of Rome, *Ep. ad Cor.*, 46) was common among the West Roman Fathers. On account of their cosmological perspective --- and the heresies that challenged them --- the idea of the "operations" or "energies" of God was more fully elaborated by the Christian theologians of the East. In any case, Augustine was the first Christian writer to set forth grace as created for man.[120]

The doctrine of uncreated grace, therefore, is not "Palamite" and not "original speculation," but runs the entire length of the Church's Tradition. St Gregory merely formulated tacit aspects of Christian charitology. Like the Fathers before him, he attempted to define, in the face of philosophical menace, the revealed Faith of Christianity concerning the nature of grace.[121]

During the 14th century theological controversy, the chief foe of St Gregory Palamas was the Augustinian, Barlaam of Italian Calabria. Following "the Latin tradition," he took for granted that the glory of God disclosed to the Saints in this life, was created; and, if the glory of God, then, His grace also.[122] St Gregory asked: how shall we be deified if the grace and glory of God are finite? How do we participate in the divine Nature if grace is not somehow an extension of It? The answer, said the Saint, is found in the antinomic character of Divinity, that is, in a theology which Augustine and the post-Orthodox West had discarded.[123]

Grace, along with God's other Energies, is the

manifestation of "those things which are made known by the supra-existential, supra-divine Trinity," St Gregory affirmed.[124] Necessarily, therefore, we must recognize a distinction between the Essence of God which is "incommunicable" and "imparticipatible" and the Energies which are both "communicable and "participatible."[125] This distinction obviates the Augustinian-Thomist *analogia entis* and any notion of divine predetermination, inasmuch as the divine Energies differ from the divine Knowledge and Will.[126]

FOOTNOTES

1. The rational criteria for defining which Christian writer is a Church Father are limited. The honor is not bestowed by the Church on a man after prolonged analysis of his life and doctrine, although, of course, he is always a person of extraordinary piety and soundness of faith. His Orthodoxy is not understood as holding scientifically constructed doctrine; he is not excluded from the patristic roll by the wrong formulation of the Christian teaching. He must have the "mind of the Church," an obscure phrase, to be sure; but the Church knows her sons. Only she is infallible and it is she --- or rather the Holy Spirit --- Who determines her spokesman. More will be said on the subject later.

2. F. Prat writes that "predestination," at an early date, had a different connotation in the West than in the East. "In Latin, the words *praedestinatio* and *praedestinatus* had a meaning to which we are now accustomed --- namely that of predestination to glory or to grace and glory, while the Greek Fathers had preserved the meaning which may be called *exegetical* --- that which these words have in St Paul --- of predestination to faith and grace... This explains why the Latin Fathers, in speaking of predestination, lay much more stress on the *merit* of man and do not fear to assign to predestination causes outside of God. This is because they are speaking of predestination to glory as Latin allows them to do..." (*The Theology of St Paul* [vol. 1], trans. by L. Stoddard, Westminister [Md.], 1952, p. 449).

   First, I do not see the relevance of a distinction between "predestination to glory" or "to faith and grace." Prat's exegesis of St Paul is arbitrary. The process of salvation --- deification --- involves "faith" and "grace" and "glory" to which all men are called; it is a process which begins with Baptism (St Gregory of

Nyssa). Moreover, salvation is *now*: the truth which convicts us through faith, the grace and the glory are all emanations from the Age to Come. In the Church the future is *now*, as many Saints of the Old and New Testaments could attest. This *now*, this *hodie*, σημερον "is the very essence of Christianity" (J. Danielou, *From Shadows to Reality: Studies in the Biblical Typology of the Fathers*, trans. by W. Hibberd, London, 1960, p. 16).

   Second, Professor Prat's opinion that the Latin Fathers, in opposition to the Greek Fathers, lay greater stress on the "merit" of man and "do not fear to assign causes of predestination outside of God" is misleading. One needs only read the ascetical literature of both the East and West Roman Fathers to discover his error.

   In fact, the differences between these writers is their approach to various topics and questions. The East tends to examine an issue from the divine and cosmological point of view; and the West, from the human and "political" point of view. With caution we may endorse the characterization of Charles Dumont, "*Der West zeigte eine groessere Empfaenglichkeit des Menschen zu Gott ohne den engen zusammenhang aufzuheben, koennte man mit anderen worten sagen: Fuer den Osten is Christ eher der* Gott-*mensch, fur den Westen der mensch*-Gott" *("Katholiken und Orthodoxe am Voraband des Konzils,"* in *Seit Neunhundret Jahren getrennte Christenheit*, E.V Jvanka, *hrsg.*, Vienna, 1962, 116).

3. In *The Apostolic Fathers*, volume I of *The Fathers of the Church*. ed. by L. Schopp, New York, 1947. This volume also includes the *Letters* of St Ignatios of Antioch, the *Letter* and *Martyrdom of St Polycarp* and the *Letter* of St Barnabas, all of which we cite in this chapter.

4. Volume I of *The Ante-Nicene Fathers* (ed. by A. Roberts & J. Donaldson, Buffalo, 1887 and reprinted, Grand Rapids, Mich.) contains, among others, the works of St Justin Martyr and *Against the Heresies* by St Irenaeos, Bishop of Lyons.

5. Volume V of the same collection offers the works of St Hippolytos and St Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage.

6. *De unit. eccl.* PL 5 409-536. Unlike St Cyprian, Augustine recognized the "validity" of the heretical "sacraments."

7. *Ep.* LXVII, 5. Some scholars consider this letter to be spurious, because it resembles Canon 110 of the 7th Council of Carthage. The letter is written in the idiom of the Pelagian controversy. Yet, the letter has not a single word about "original sin." E.W. Benson refers to it as "anti-Augustinian" (*Cyprian: His Life, His Times, His Work*, London, 1897, p. 297).

8. In volume IX of *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers* (ed. by P. Schaff & H. Wace. Grand Rapids, 1955) are St Hilary's *On the Trinity*, *Homilies on the Psalms* and *On the Councils*.

9. *Comm. Matt.* X, 24 PL 9 976.

10. *Dial. adv. Pelag.* III, 7 PL 23 603C.

11. *Ibid.*, III, 6 602C. God does not save us irrationally, said Jerome, but on the basis of human cooperation --- *non salvat [Deus] irrationabiliter, et absque judicii veritate; sed causis praecedentibus; quia alii non susceperunt Filium Dei: alii autem recipere sua sponte volerunt* (*Ep.*, CXX, v. 83 [Rom. 8:28] PL 22 1000).

12. *Ibid.*, I, 2 PL 23 522A.

13. *Ibid.*, I, 5 523AB.

14. *Ibid.*, I, 16 533B.

15. *Ibid.*, II, 29 593C.

16. *Ibid.*, III, 6 601D.

17. *Ibid.*, III, 18 616A. Jerome quoted Cyprian's letter to Fidus in connection with Romans 5:14, "death which reigned from Adam unto Moses, even over those who had not sinned after the transgression and likeness of Adam." The context relates "to a chain of mortality." The Saint mentions no "inherited guilt," although he employs the term "original sin" frequently. Such rhetoric may have been fashionable in some circles; or he may have been attempting by the use of such language to disassociate himself from the Pelagianism and Origenism with which some had linked him.

Jerome, early in his career at least, did not hold Augustine in high regard. He labelled some of the Bishop's ideas "heretical" and his younger contemporary a "pedant" (See their correspondence in *A Treasury of Early Christianity*, ed. with Introduction by A. Freemantle, New York, 1953, pp. 94-102). They were later reconciled. At the same time, Jerome was never an advocate of Augustine's doctrine. For example, he wrote, "You should know this, that Baptism forgives sins, but does not insure future righteousness which is preserved through industry and diligence and, to be sure, the Mercy of God; so that it is ours to ask, His to grant; ours to begin, His to accomplish; ours to offer what we can, His to complete what is beyond our power" (*Dial. c. Pel.* III, 1 PL 23 596C).

18. *De Myst.* VI, 32 PL 16 398.

19. *De excessu Sat.* II, 6 PL 16 1317.

20. *Exp. in Luc.* VI, 234 PL 15 1852B. Elsewhere St Ambrose declared, "In his [Adam] guilt is the death of all" --- *Illiu igitur culpa mors omnium est* (*op.cit.*, IV, 67 1717A).

21. *Alia est iniquitas nostra, alia calnanei nostri, in quo Adam dente serpentis est vulneratus, et obnoxiam hereditatem successsionis humanae suo vulnere dereliquit ut omnes illo vulnere caludicamus* (*Ps.* XLVII, 8,9 PL 14 1214D. Cf. 1415AB).

22. *In Ps. 43 ennar.*, 47 PL 14 1165B.

23. This is Ambrose's "prevenient grace."

24. The difference between Augustine and the Fathers

is clear. Whereas the latter allow that God pursues us, He does not compel us. "Augustine maintains," writes N.P. Williams, "that God not merely provides the opportunity of starting on the road of salvation, but operates in man the will to accept the opportunity, so that not the faintest and most elementary beginnings of man's Godward aspiration arise from himself; and any attempt to assign man even the most infinitesimal share in the work of his own salvation is remorselessly beaten down with the bludgeon of the great proof-text, 'what hast thou that thou hast not received' (I Cor. 4:7)." (*The Grace of God*, London, 1930, p. 49).

25. *Expos. in Luc.* II, 84 PL 15 1666A. The Anglican scholar, F.H. Dudden criticizes Ambrose for a charitology which is "not strictly logical or consistent" while, at the same time, he intrudes the pseudo-Ambrosian treatise, *Apologia David altera*, into the discussion. He knows that it is not the work of the Saint, but because it contains a theory of "original sin" not unlike Augustine's, Dudden, his critique notwithstanding, seeks to associate the name of St Ambrose with the teachings of Augustine through this treatise (See *The Life and Times of St Ambrose* [vol. 2], Oxford, 1935, pp. 6-12, 624, 707).

26. *De Fid.* V, 83 [Rom. 8:29] PL 16 665.

27. St John and those who followed him saw Augustine's idea of grace as "contrary to the mind of the Fathers," clearly an "innovation," a "falsification" of St Paul's teachings (see Owen Chadwick, *John Cassian*, Cambridge [Eng.], 1968, p. 128).

28. *Coll.* XIII, 18 PL 49 946B.

29. *Haec ergo duo, id est, vel gratia Dei, vel liberum arbitrium sibi quidem invincem videntur adversa, sed utraque concordat et utraque nos partiter debere suscipere pietas ratione colligimus, ne unum horum homini subtrahentes ecclesiasticae fidei regulam eccessisse videamur* (*Conl.* XIII, 1; *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum*. [vol. XIII], Vienna, 1866-, 377).

30. *Ibid.*, 12, 7 (380f.).

31. *The Grace of God*, pp. 50-51.

32. The last surviving letter of the correspondence between St Paulinus and Augustine is dated 408. The *Letters* of the former have been translated in *Ancient Christian Writers* (vols. 35-36), edited by J. Quasten (London, 1966-1968); and in the same collection (vol. 40) are Paulinus' *Poems* (New York, 1975).

33. *Sermo* CXLVIII PL 52 597D. Common in the writings of the Fathers is the doctrine that the unity of the human race was "shattered" by Adam's Fall. In Christ humanity is "reintegrated" (Eph. 1:10). The Church, as His Body, is the beginning of the new mankind. Outside of her, St Peter writes, "the outpouring of grace is lost" --- *perdit gratiae largitatem* (*Sermo* CXXXII, 563B).

34. *Sermo* CXI (Rom. 5:12), 507C.

35. *Ibid.*, 505B.

36. *Ibid.*, 506A.

37. *Sermo* XL, 313D; and *aut quod vos facit consortium divinitas intrare* (391A). Cf. *Sermo* LXVII, 392A.

38. *Sermo* XLIII, 320D.

39. *Sermo* LXVII, 391A. Cf. *Sermo* LXX, 400A.

40. *Sermo* LXX, 399A.

41. *Sermo* CXIII, 501C. Cf. *et nec peccato, sed homini largitus est gratiam* (511A).

42. *Sermo* CIX, 501D.

43. *Hom.* III, 2 PL 52 700C.

44. *Hom.* III, 1 700AB.

45. *Hom.* XI, 2 725D.

46. *Loc.cit.*

47. *Hom.* XIV, 7 738AB

48. *Hom.* XIX, 4 751B.

49. *Manual of Patrology and History of Theology* (vol. 2), trans. by. Howitt, Paris, 1940, p. 134.

50. *Sermo* XXIV, 2 PL 54 204C-205A.

51. *Loc.cit.*

52. *Sermo* XXIV, 3 206A.

53. *Sermo* XXVII, 2 217CD.

54. *Sermo* XXVI, 1 208C. The Pelagians took exception to the statement that the grace of God is given to those who merit and accept it --- *gratia Dei secundum merita dari acceptientum sentiatur.* In opposition to them, St Leo maintained that grace is given freely for great spiritual effort, and not as reward *per naturalem industrium.* I hasten to add that his position gives no comfort to Augustinians. True, the Pope used the words *peccatum originalis* several times, but not as if every human being were guilty of it; rather Adam's sin has left a wound in our nature --- *ut quae ante gratiam proprio clara sit studio nullo videatur peccati originalis vulnare sauciata* (*Ep.* I, 3 PL 54 595A-596A). Death is the sentence of the "original sin." On account of Adam's transgression, his offspring became prisoners of the devil. Overcome by the Cross and Resurrection of Christ, his captives are released. Hence, "Our nature, cleansed from the old contagion, regains its honorable estate: death is destroyed by death..." --- *Redit in honorem suum ab antiquis contagiis purgata natura, mors morte destruitur* (*Serm.* XXII, 4 197C).

55. *Sermo* XXXVIII, 3 261C-262A.

56. In his *The Rule of Saint Benedict: A Doctrine and Spiritual Commentary* (trans. by J.B. Hasbrouck. Kalamazoo, 1983), Adalbert de Vogüé touches on Benedict's connection with Augustine's idea of the monastery as "a school of Christ" (*schola Christi*), i.e., the monastic community as the place "to educate souls according to the teachings of Christ and to lead them to salvation" (p. 22). For Augustine, the monastery completes the work ("education") of the Church (*De disc. christ.*, 11-12 PL 40 675-676). He saw the monastery as a scholastic establishment (among other spiritual things) and the imagery of his language shows it. The same kind of imagery occasionally appears in the *Rule* of St Benedict which leads some writers to believe that he viewed the monastic life in the manner of Augustine. His interest in typology is ostensibly an example of Augustine's influence (Vogüé, p. 39 ft. 13), as if common words and phraseology betoken dependence; but typology is an ordinary patristic method for interpreting the Old Testament Scriptures. In any case, no motive but "perfection of the heart" --- as St John Cassian (and St Basil) taught him --- ought to be attributed to St Benedict's asceticism. I do not gather from reading his *Rule* or from Pope St Gregory's *Dialogi* any other ideal (see footnote 58).

57. *The Rule* of St Benedict, trans. by O.H. Blair in E.M. Heufelder's *The Way to God: According to Saint Benedict*, trans. by L. Eberle, Kalamazoo, 1983.

58. At the heart of Augustine's monachism, Louis Bouyer explains, is the idea of *sapientia* (rather than the patristic *gnosis*), that is to say, the Bishop of Hippo was not so much concerned with "the mystery of God in Christ" as with "the mystery of ourselves which God, which Christ, helps us to unravel" (*The Spirituality of the New Testament and the Fathers* [vol. 1], p. 493). This attitude, says Bouyer, consitutes a "change in orientation" for Christian spirituality. He has to admit that in St Benedict there is no trace "of the pastoral concerns which led, as with Augustine, to such a mutation of the very idea of what a monk should be" (*Ibid.*, p. 512). Bouyer is

wrong, incidentally, to think that patristic monasticism (especially in the East), unlike Augustine, "justifies itself by a disgust of this world and of the body" (*ibid.*,, p. 494). The "disgust" of the Fathers is for the passions of the body, not God's creation; and for this "age" and not the cosmos. Rather it is Augustine who is contemptuous of matter.

59. *Ep.* XLVIII; bk. II PL 77 588C.

60. *Moralia* XVI, 25 PL 75 1135B.

61. *Ibid.*, XXIV, 10 PL 76 299CD.

62. "Augustine's view of grace as moral power which in the elect infallibly attains its end (i.e., the salvation of its subject) could not possibly harmonize with the scheme of St Gregory," writes Dudden, "which made the free and independent action of the human will an essential factor in the work of salvation" (*Gregory the Great* [vol. I]. p. 400).

63. *Hom. in Ezek.*I, ix, 8 PL 76 873C.

64. *Dial.* I, 8 PL 77 188B. The Greek translation is: καὶ αὐτὴ γὰρ ἡ τῆς αἰωνίου βασιλείας κληρονομία παρὰ τοῦ παντοδυνάμου θεοῦ τοῖς ἐκλεκτοῖς προορισθεῖσα ὑπάρχει, διὰ δὲ καμάτου πολλοῦ καὶ δεήσεως λαμβάνειν αὐτούς ἠυδοκησεν, ἅπερ πρὸ τῶν αἰώνων δωρήσασθαι προώρισεν (187B).

65. *Moralia* XXVIII, 2 (*A Library of the Fathers* [vol. 3:1],. trans. by members of the English Church. Oxford, 1887).

66. *Ibid.*, XXV, 21.

67. *Ibid.*, II, 78 PL 75 593C.

68. *Ibid.*, IX, 13 963C.

69. Thus, *gratia praeveniens* or *praeparans* (or the grace which predecedes human choice), *gratia operans* (grace acting within us), *gratia cooperans* (synergy), *gratia perficiens* (the grace of perfection) and, finally, *donum perseverantiae* (the grace of perseverance), all originating with Augustine, were developed in the Latin Middle Ages.

70. See N. Globoukovsky, "Grace in the Greek Fathers," in *The Doctrine of Grace*, ed. by W.T. Whitley, New York, 1931, p. 63f.

71. *Ad Eph.*, 19 (See footnote 3).

72. The 6th volume of *The Fathers of the Church* (ed. by T.B. Falls, New York, 1948) contains the works of St Justin the Martyr ("the Philosopher") in English.

73. "There does not appear to any trace of the idea of 'original guilt' in the thought of Athanasius," states N.P. Williams (*The Ideas of the Fall and Original Sin*, London, 1927, p. 261).

74. *Vita Ant.*, 19 PG 26 872A.

75. *Contra Ar.* I, 58 PG 26 133A.

76. *Ep.* III, *Pascha*, 3 PG 26 1373B, C.

77. *Ep.* VI, 5 PG 26 1385CD.

78. *Spir. Hom.* XV, 40 PG 34 604B.

79. *De cust. Cor.*, 12 PG 34 833D.

80. *Spir. Hom.* XXVI, 2 PG 34 676B.

81. See chapter IV.

82. *In Ep. ad Rom.* PG 74 828D-829A.

83. *Selected Letters* VI, 20, pp. 200-204 (ed. by L.R. Wickham, Oxford, 1983). See J. Meyendorff, "εφ' ω [Rom. 5:12] *chez Cyrille d'Alexandre et Theodoret*," *Studia Patristica*, ed. by F.L. Cross.

Berlin, 1961, 157-161.

84. *In Ep. ad Rom.* IX, 1 PG 60 541.

85. *Ibid.*, XV, 2 542.

86. *Ep. ad Heb.* XXXIV, 34 PG 63 234-235.

87. *In Ep. ad Rom.* IX, 2 468.

88. *Ibid.*, X, 1 475.

89. *Ibid.*, X, 2 476.

90. *Ibid.*, XIII, 1 507.

91. See the discussion in Timothy Ware's (Archbishop Kallistos) Introduction to *The Art of Prayer*, trans. by E. Kadloubovsky & E.M. Palmer London, 1973, pp. 9-38.

92. *Const. monast.*, 15 PG 31 1377BC.

93. *Serm. ascet.* I PG 31 872. St Basil refers to grace as ενεργεια (Ep. XXXVIII, 4 PG 32 329).

94. *Ora.* XXXVII, 13 PG 36 297CD.

95. *Ora.* XVIII, 5, 6 PG 35 992A, C.

96. *Carm. Lib. I Theol.* VIII, 107 PG 37 676A.

97. According to the Fathers, grace is uncreated, an extension of the Divinity. God relates Himself to the creation by it. Grace impacts man and nature in various ways. We experience the "effects" of grace as God's "love," "wrath," etc. (See. A. Kalomiros, "The River of Fire," *St Nectarios Orthodox Conference* [22-25 July 1980], Seattle, 1980, 103-131). The Fathers do not provide, as does Aquinas (*Summa Theologica* II-II, Q. CXI), a classification of different graces. His authority on the topic is, of course, Augustine, whom he quotes five times in this Question. Cf. *S.T.*,Qs.

CXX, CXXIII, CXI.

98. *De inst. Christ.* PG 46 289C.

99. *Ora. cat. mag.*, 36 PG 45 92D.

100. Whitley makes a useful comment on the charitology of the Greek Fathers. "Thus, it is certain that the extremes of Augustinianism and Pelagianism which had their historical grounds in the West were quite strange to Eastern theology...which decisively and without exception, maintained the idea of freedom of the will which, although considerably damaged by sin, is not destroyed entirely... At the same time, man still preserves the inborn tendency towards good, and hence possesses sufficient energy, being free to ... fulfill the possibilities of ethical choice very really if not perfectly." From this point of view, Whitley says, grace finds in man the "readiness and organic capacity" to do good and, therefore, not a resistance to grace which would be characteristic of an intrinsically depraved nature (*The Doctrine of Grace*, pp. 82f.). I am compelled to add that "Eastern theology," if in fact there is such a thing, is not alone in its view of man and grace. We have already seen that the Fathers, East and West, share a common conception of them.

101. *Vita sanct. Macr.* PG 46 984CD.

102. The Greek text has been edited and translated by C. Garton and L.G. Westernik (Anthusa Monograph, 7), Buffalo, n.d.; and appears in Migne, volume 98, among the works of St Photios.

103. *Boundaries* XVIII, 23-25 (Garton & Westernik).

104. *Loc.cit.*

105. *Ibid.*, XXXVI, 10.

106. *Ibid.*, XXIV, 26-27; XXVI, 1-4.

107. *Ibid.*, XXVIII, 13-18.

108. In Germanos's preface to *Boundaries*, he offers a defense of St Gregory of Nyssa, denying all charges of "Origenism." The Patriarch insisted that Gregory's writings had been corrupted by his enemies. I mention this fact only because the Orthodox friends of Augustine often point to the "errors" of St Gregory to justify the "exaggerations" of Augustine.

109. *De fid. orthod.* II, 28 PG 94 961C.

110. *Ibid.*, II, 30 977D.

111. *Ibid.*, II. 25 957C.

112. *Ibid.*, II, 30 972A-976A.

113. *Ibid.*, II, 30 969B.

114. Photios' knowledge of the Pelagian controversy was inadequate. He stated that the heresiarch visited the East in search for vindication of his false doctrine; that Pelagius was condemned by the Council of Carthage under Aurelius. Photios also recorded that after the death of Augustine ἐν ἁγιοῖς, his enemies began to say that he "did away with free will" (ἀναίρεσιν τοῦ αὐτεξουσίου); but Pope Celestine, "that divine man," warned all the bishops of this calumny. Photius also mentioned that not only was the Pelagian error anathematized by the Council of Ephesos, but Pope Gelasius likewise condemned "Pelagius, Celestius and Julian with all their followers." The Patriarch also knows that in the time of Pope Leo, "a certain Prosper" (ἄνθρωπος ὡς ἀληθῶς τοῦ θεοῦ) became leader of the Augustinian party (*Bibl.* 54 PG 103 96B-97A). St Photios displays no familiarity with doctrine of Augustine or Pelagius.

115. *Frag. in* ep. *ad Rom.* PG 101 1233C. Photios told Ecumenios that because of Adam's transgression, death visited his entire posterity. The Apostle, Photios said, declared that we die because of our own sins: the death we inherited on account of Adam's disobedience (*Comm in ep. Rom.* VII PG 118 416C).

116. *Ibid.*, 1244A. Augustine gave special attention to Rom. 8:28, as we shall see.

117. *Ibid.*, 1245B.

118. *Ad Amph.* q. XLI PG 101 284D.

119. See Photios' dialogue with Ecumenios, *Comm. in ep. ad Rom.*, 7 PG 118 416A-420B.

120. See R.J. Riga, "Created Grace in Augustine," in *Augustinian Studies* III (1972), 113-130. The author claims to find a doctrine of uncreated grace in his writings.

121. See J.S. Romanides, "Notes on the Palamite Controversy and Related Topics," 186ff.; and J. Meyendorff, *A Study of Gregory Palamas*, trans. by G. Lawrence, London, 1964, p. 27.

122. Augustine's theory of created grace and glory is conspicuous in his treatment of the religious experience of the O.T. patriarchs and prophets and the N.T. apostles. See chap. V.

123. Lossky, *The Mystical Theology...*, pp. 67-90.

124. St Gregory Palamas, *Theol., Moral., Phys., Chap.*, 34 PG 150 1140D.

125. See the discussion in B. Krivosheine, "The Ascetic and Theological Teaching of Gregory Palamas," *The Eastern Churches Quarterly* IV (1938). Reprint.

126. St Gregory Palamas, *Theol., Moral., Phys., Chap.*, 98 PG 150 1189C.

Chapter III

Platonism: The Philosophy of Augustine

Any discussion of Augustine's philosophy invariably leads to the question of his indebtedness to Platonism; and to the further inquiry: which Platonism? Surely, not the Platonism of Origen; neither, let me add, did Augustine fall so completely under the spell of pagan thought as did Origen.[1] Neither, contrary to much scholarly opinion, was it the "Platonism" of St Gregory of Nyssa, the "Platonism" he, and so many other Fathers, found so useful in the delineation of Christian doctrine. Indeed, it was not the same "Platonism" --- nor did Augustine and the Fathers employ pagan thought generally in the same way.

No doubt the Fathers adapted the language and methods, even the concepts of Greek and Latin philosophers. Providence, as the Church taught, had prepared everything in history for the Advent of the Saviour, including Hellenism which, as Judaism, was a "tutor unto Christ." Nevertheless, the Church and her Fathers had a different understanding of time and history than paganism and, consequently, they held a different view of man, history and human culture.[2]

In other words, among those Christian writers whom

the Church acknowledges as her spokesmen, there could be no synthesis of Christianity and Hellenism which in "principle" were anithetical. There could not be, nor was there, any "communion between between light and darkness" (II Cor. 6: 14); and, therefore, such labels as "Christian Platonism" or "Christian Aristotelianism" or "Christian Stoicism" have no meaning for her.

In the case of Augustine, we may speak with far less confidence; in fact, his attraction to Platonism --- specifically Plotinos of Lycopolis (204-270) and his school (Neo-Platonism)[3] --- was very serious, perhaps fatal. He did more than accessorize his theology with it. From this Greek philosopher and his *Enneads*, more than any other, Augustine borrowed the principles to develop his Christian version of Greek philosophy.

Augustine expressed gratitude in his *Confessions* to Plotinos for setting him on the road of truth and, eventually, of his conversion to the Orthodox Church. The religio-philosophical tenets he discussed in the *Confessions* and elsewhere were largely inspired by the *Enneads*. Augustine even compared the writings of Plotinos with the holy Scriptures --- *apud Platonicos me interim, quod sacris nostris non repugnet, reperturm esse confido* (*Contra Acad.* III, xx, 43 PL 32 957). Augustine not only paraphrased him, but often quoted him directly. His dependence on the founder of Neo-Platonism is "indisputable."[4]

1. Faith and Reason

Augustine firmly held the compatibility of Neo-Platonism and Christianity, for which reason, of course, he dared to adapt its metaphysics to the Christian revelation.[5] As he wrote,

> For we made selection of the Platonists, justly esteemed the noblest of philosophers, because they had the wit to perceive that the human soul, immortal and rational or intellectual, as it is, cannot be happy except by partaking of the light of that God by whom both itself and the world were made; and also that the happy life which all men desire cannot be reached by anyone who does not cleave with a pure and holy love to the one supreme good, the unchangeable God.[6]

With these *philosophi nobilissimi*, he continues, "we have no dispute on these matters." He will later dampen his ardor for "the Platonists";[7] yet his mind had by then so adjusted to their way of thinking that Neo-Platonism had become the inextricable but unspoken companion of all his labors. Allusions to Plotinos *cum sui* diminished during the last ten years of Augustine's life, largely because he had dedicated his waning energies to the resolution of theological problems, in particular the challenge to the Church from Arianism and Pelagianism.

Long before that final decade of his life, Augustine set about delineating his Greek-Christian synthesis. Its realization required certain modifications in both its components. The effort to adapt one to the other predictably led to questions about the relationship between "faith" (*fides*, πιστις) or "authority" and "reason" (*ratio*, διανοία) or "philosophy."

a. In his letter to Consentius (written in 410), Augustine distinguished between "the philosophies of the world" and "our [Christian] philosophy" which, as

he later told Julian of Eclanum, is simply the true philosophy --- *nostra christiana, quae una est vera philosophia, quandoquidem studium vel amor sapientiae significatur hoc nomine* (*Cont. Jul.* IV, xiv 17 PL 44 774). Moreoever, Christian philosophy rests on "faith" which Augustine defined as "thinking with assent" --- *credere nihil aliud est quam cum assensione cogitare* (*De praed. sanct.*, 2 PL 44 963).

This faith is a gift of God. "Since we are incapable of thinking anything of genuine value relative to religion and piety, "Augustine writes, "we are surely incapable of believing anything of ourselves, since we cannot do this without thinking; thus, our sufficiency is our belief is God" (*De praed. sanct.*, 5 PL 44 962-963). The unbeliever, of course, has no such "sufficiency," because he does not believe.

There is, then, a difference between the philosophy which unbelievers pursue and the philosophy to which Christians adhere: the first proceeds by reasoning and the latter by authority or faith (*De ord.* II, v, 16 PL 32 1002). Also, the Christian philosophy is superior to Hellenism, whether the Platonic philosophy or any other school of thought. All pre-Christian wisdom was but a preparation for the philosophy of the Church. Thus, as Moses was prepared by the wisdom of the Egyptians for his Sinai experience, so Platonism prepared the nations for Christianity, a fact, incidentally, which allows the Christian philosopher to "despoil the treasures" of the Greeks as Old Israel despoiled the temples of the Egyptians during the Exodus.

In other words, Augustine told Consentius that rational inquiry (philosophy) is pursued in order to grasp by reason what is already held by faith. For

him, Platonism is, to borrow the celebrated medieval phrase, "the handmaiden to faith," in the construction of the Christian philosophy. Do not think, he cautions Consentius, that it lessens the value of faith, for "by the light of reason we see what we hold firmly by faith" --- *non ut fidem respuas, sed ut ea quae fidei firmitate iam tenes, etiam rationis luce conspicias.* He admitted that "there are things for which no reason can be given, but it does not follow that one does not exist, for God made nothing without reason."[8] Augustine further states that enlightened faith "has eyes to see what reason cannot yet see."[9]

Thus, Augustine did not seek to know in order to believe, but to believe in order to know; but, also, truth believed must be transformed (whenever possible) to truth known and, therefore, the content of his "Christian philosophy" is a body of rational truths discovered, explored or simply preserved with the help, even the guidance of divine revelation. He was confident that there are a number of truths given by faith which can be shown to be true by reason.

Augustine anticipated the Anselmian *fides quaerens intellectum;* and quotes the Prophet Isaiah in behalf of the proposition --- *Fides quaerit, intellectus invenit; propter quod aut propheta [Isa. 7: 9]: Nisi credideritis non intelligetis.*[10] Of course, he added quickly, in certain matters reason precedes faith (*ipsa ratio antecedit fidem*), that is, in matters not directly bearing on revelation, such as physics and mathematics.[11] Unaided reason can achieve a modicum of wisdom or truth. If nothing else, it recognizes truth to be a universal and spiritual reality, if only by the fact that mathematical numbers are discovered and certified without the senses. There is, in fact, "one

truth present to all alike" (*an vero unam presto esse communiter omnibus*), especially "to those who exercize their reason" (*omnibus ratiocinantibus*), as he writes in *De Libero Arbitrio.*

Christianity, however, is the true wisdom, not only because it is the full and pure revelation of the salvific *sapientia*, but because her Teacher is "the Teacher of all, namely Christ, 'the unchangeable and everlasting Wisdom.' He is the Wisdom which every rational soul does indeed consult, but which reveals Itself to each according to his capacity to grasp by reason of the good or evil disposition of his will."[12] It follows, says Augustine, that pagan wisdom is incomplete and mixed with human error, although some pagans like the Neo-Platonists have seen the truth "from afar" (*de longinquo*).

Like Augustine himself, the Platonists defined philosophy as the knowledge of God and the soul. The soul is the *principia* of thinking, of reason. He defined "reason" as "the movement of the mind capable of distinguishing and interrelating what is learned" --- *Ratio est mentis motio, ea quae discuntur distinguendi et connectendi potens* (*De ord.* XI, 30 PL 32 1009). As the soul, it may be the recipient of divine enlightenment. Such a gift is possible by virtue of the soul's relationship to God, that is to say, by the analogy of being and; consequently, by the analogy of knowing. The philosophy of Augustine begins with this assumption.

This is not the mentality of the Fathers. Any reference to Christianity as "the highest" or "true philosophy," is reference to her as a unique and indemonstrable wisdom. The "faith" required "to know" (ἐπιγνωρίζειν) her mysteries, is, indeed, the gift of

grace; and, consequently, a "knowing" of its own, a "knowing" which enlists the historical facts, but which engages the supra-rational and the spiritual. This realm is open to them who have embraced Christ and His Church in true faith in love. Christianity was not revealed to become rational and she does not promise rational certitude.

b. The "harmony" of "faith" and "reason" --- in which the Christian religion is "faith" and "Hellenism" is "reason" --- if we believe Augustine, is nothing more than the reconciliation of wisdom with itself. There is some truth in his words if he meant that Christ is the source of every wisdom and that it may be found everywhere. Unlike the Fathers, however, Augustine viewed both "natural" and "supernatural wisdom" as essentially the same. No wonder the Bishop of Hippo found little difficulty in attempting to harmonize them.

Although St Gregory Palamas, among others, considered rational philosophy "a gift from God" --- that is, a tool for the understanding of man's environment[13] --- he made no effort to reconcile the inferior "natural wisdom" and the "divine wisdom" born of faith and dispassion. Greek philosophy, he said, is *principally* no kin to the Christian revelation which is unique, a "mystery" hidden from all eternity, disclosed only in Jesus Christ, a truth whose purpose is salvific, not intellectual. In any case, all human wisdom has become pretentious, Gregory and the Christian tradition tell us. Not without "elements" of truth, yet it has no power to change the "hearts" of men. God has "made foolish the wisdom of the world" (I Cor. 1:20). Thus, pagan learning is invested with no special power and no special place is reserved for it

in patristic literature.[14]

Moreover, whatever "truth" God has deposited in nature has its ultimate purpose, as already mentioned, as a "tutor unto Christ" (cf. Rom. 1:14). There is a sense, then, in which Jesus is the fulfillment of pagan philosophy and myth; hence, the patristic typology. The study of Hellenism, consequently, is undertaken with care: it is full of "poison" and very little "honey," a distinction heretics fail to make --- πάσας ἢ τὰς πλείστας τῶν δεινῶν αἱρέσεων ἐντεῦθεν λαβούσας τὰς ἀρχάς.[15] In addition, the Fathers caution us that the truth about God and the soul, good and evil, wisdom and illusion, takes much more than intellectual acumen to identify, to appropriate or to augment; it involves more than reason --- which without grace is in a most unhealthy and unnatural state --- to achieve power of *gnosis*. He who wishes to behold and assimilate the saving truth must have the "purity of heart" which is the fruit of revealed faith.

The "true philosopher" or "theologian" possesses, then, the uncreated Light which transcends "the dim illumination" and "feeble efforts of human reason" (διανοίας ἀμυδραῖς ἐπιβολαῖς), of which Barlaam --- and, indeed, of which Augustine --- spoke. To "know" (ἐπιγνωρίζειν) God and spiritual reality demands "purification" (καθάρσις) of soul and body --- not merely as Plotinos thought, the negation of mental images. On this matter, the Archbishop of Thessalonica quotes *The Theological Orations* (I, 3) of St Gregory the Theologian: "Only past masters of meditation (θεωρία), purified in body and soul... may philosophize about God." In fact, the true theologian is already united to Him, since he is becoming "godlike." In a few words, the knowledge of revealed truth requires "the

effulgence of the Holy Spirit."[16]

c. According to Augustine, Christian philosophy (and theology) albeit enlisting piety, is a rational enterprise with methods and aims not unlike any other science. It also demands "theoretical certainty" --- *certissma ratione* --- which requires that Christian thought *qua* science rests on valid presuppositions. In order to give rational answers to them that inquire, Christian theology and/or "philosophy" must have a "starting point," namely, an ineluctable and universal presupposition upon which all else depends. He finds that "starting point," anticipating Descartes, in the self's indubitable existence.

> It is beyond question that I exist and that I know and love that existence. In these truths, there is nothing to fear from the argument of the Academics: what if you are mistaken? Since if I am mistaken, I am. One who does not exist cannot possibly be mistaken. Thus, if I am mistaken, this very fact proves that I am... Accordingly, since I must exist in order to be mistaken, even if I should be mistaken in this, I know myself as knowing. It follows, then, that I could be mistaken as to the fact that I know myself as knowing... as I know myself to exist; so, also, I know this, that I know. And when I love these things, I add to them a certain third thing, namely, my love which has equal moment. For neither am I deceived in this love, since in those things which I love, I am not deceived; though even if these were false, it would be that I love false things...[17]

Augustine's epistemology is important for several reasons: it shows that he does not base his rational concerns on faith, revealed or otherwise, but on argument which, from a human point of view is the self, is the beginning of all thought and, in truth, the first principle of his system. From this epistemology Augustine derives his idea of God. As we shall see, he hoped to prove the existence of the Trinity from the nature and existence of the self.

In this way, too, Augustine determined not only to give rational credentials to the Christian religion, but to offer it as the final answer to all the questions of all rational inquiry. The result of this ambition, however, was further entrenchment of the dualism which extended even to his conception of the relationship between "faith" and "reason". "The Christian Faith" for him was indeed "the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen" (Heb.11:1); but to say that it must be elevated to the status of rational knowledge is to imply that such knowledge is superior to faith.

Augustine must have been aware of this criticism. He, therefore, declared that Christianity was the greater "philosophy" because she gives the ultimate knowledge. She provides us with the choice between philosophical problems. If, moreover, Augustine put Greek thought at the service of Christianity, it was because he believed reason is the same in everyone. The Christian Faith merely discloses those matters which "reason" could not ordinarily have discovered or demonstrated by itself.

d. One can show Augustine's heavy reliance on Hellenism, especially Plotinos, by indicating passages

lifted from the *Enneads* for the development of his own system, a labor already undertaken for us by 19th century scholarship (Bouillet, Grandgeorge, Dorner, Reuter, Schubert, etc.). They directed their enormous talents to the internal criticism of Augustine's writings along with comparative studies, that is, identifying passages, phrases and words borrowed by the African from Marius Victorinus' Latin translation of the *Enneads*, a translation which Augustine read with scrupulous devotion.[18]

Undoubtedly, the value of any literary criticism, particularly in the case of religious figures, ought not to neglect the writers purpose, nor his consistency with what he conceives to be his "ultimate concern" and "commitment."[19] Yes, an Orthodox evaluation of Augustine's Platonism hangs on his treatment of the Christian Faith far more than whatever assistance he may have received from her enemies, that is, whether he, like Origen, denatured "the experience of the unfathomable depths of God by philosophical concepts."[20]

We may agree with Augustine's apologists that historians, often "anti-Christian," sometimes "anti-Catholic," cannot be wholly trusted in their critique of him; but, also, none can deny the modern scholarship in general has contributed greatly to our understanding of church history and doctrine. Without their labors, we could not offer a critical assessment of Augustine's religio-philosophical enterprise. Without them, we may have never known the degree to which Augustine was indebted to the Greeks.

Those scholarly labors, not so incidentally, help us to understand St John Cassian's rebuff of Augustine as "audacious," as passing beyond the limits set by the

divine mystery.[21] Historical research marks clearly "the boundaries set by the Fathers" and the many who have ignored them, not the least of whom was Augustine. Eventually, the Church, in order to bridle such "audacity" in matters of faith, will proclaim in the 11th century Byzantine *Synodikon*:

> Anathema to those who devote themselves to Greek studies and instead of merely employing them as a part of their education, adopt the foolish doctrines of the ancients and accept them as truth. Anathema to those who firmly believe such doctrines and recommend them to others, whether secretly or overtly.[22]

Augustine had indeed adopted "the foolish doctrines of the ancients and accepted them as truth." Hellenism was part of his thinking to the very end of his life.[23]

2. Religio-Philosophical Themes

Augustine believed God to be a spiritual being.[24] He came to that conclusion on the basis of the soul's analogy to Him. Although he once said that "God is better known by ignorance" (*qui scitur melius nesciendo*), his theology was cataphatic. The *nesciendo* may have been the remnant of traditional Christian theology or perhaps a concession to Neo-Platonism. One cannot argue persuasively that Augustine took apophaticism very seriously,[25] especially when one considers his description of God's "attributes" and His position, albeit at the summit, on the ladder of beings.

His theology is speculative and positive. In fact, Augustine's God is *mutatis mutandis* the Good of

the Platonists.[26] In addition, the Supreme Being of Augustine is defined by the eternal World of Ideas (κόσμος νοητός) which he places within the divine Logos.[27] He could not, as Plato, set them outside of God --- that is, coeternal with Him --- and, therefore, Augustine deposited them within the very Essence of God, which explains why the creation, formed according to the Ideas, reflect His Essence.[28]

The Ideas are the Forms or exemplars of things, the archetypes by which the Creator makes all finite existences. Therefore, He has the Idea of each. He possesses, the "universal" of all things as well as the specific nature (species) of things within a class. Thus, Augustine wrote to Nebridius that God not only "cogitates" the Ideas of individual beings, but their class.[29] Nature, then, according to the Plan of God, has a structure which determines the activity and end of each member. Of course, the different levels of being determine the disposition of individuals within the hierarchical cosmic structure. God is linked to "the chain of being" as the only absolute existence.

He is "absolute," because He is eternal. He is the Creator of contingent being. Whatever He has made, He accomplished in one instant, something Augustine is supposed to have learned, Boyer says, from Plotinian or Stoic philosophy.[30] Yet, coming into being at once, did not mean to him that creation achieved its final form at the primeval moment of existence. All contingent being exist *in potentia*, the Ideas as their archetypes. As the causes of things in nature, the Ideas are *rationes seminales*, that is, spiritual movement in time originating in eternity. The "seminal reasons" are a spiritual force impressed on "the dark and imperfect corporeal world," impressed by "the

co-eternal Word of the Father Who directs and moves all things to their form" (*De gen. ad litt.* I, ix, 17 PL 34 252).

Evidently, this vision of created reality was constructed by Augustine from more than one source. For instance, he claimed to have found in the book of Genesis the idea that time was created with the heavens and the earth. Yet, his cosmogony is not unambiguously Biblical. Although denying the eternity of the world, he does not flatly maintain that God created "prime matter" or "chaos" (μὴ ὄν, as the Greek philosophers called it). Moreover, the days of creation are not understood by Augustine as periods of time, but as cosmogonic categories, "didactic reasons to describe all the works of the creation, which in reality were formed simultaneously."[31]

Likewise, "In the beginning" (*ἐν ἀρχῇ, in principium*) seems to refer not to something unique, but to God's action upon formless matter --- an opinion illumined by and adapted from Plotinos' *Enneads* II and VI. To be sure, Augustine, unlike the Platonists, acknowledged God's power to create something new; yet, he says that the creation was formed not in time, but with time, "in the beginning." What is the "beginning"? He does not explain; but it must be the eternal Ideas of God. Would it not have been simpler to say that "in the beginning" is the moment when God began to create all things? But the eternal Ideas stand in the way of a direct answer to the question. They imply a certain necessity in God's acts of creation. It would seem that instead of explaining the first words of Genesis, he has explains them away.

3. Augustine and Neo-Platonism

Augustine calls God the Trinity *qui vere est, qui summe est*. He is the God of "the philosophers and savants, not the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob." Reuter makes the important observation that Augustine, in his *De Trinitate*, disregarded the Nicean Creed and the theology it presupposes.[32] Paul Henry says, moreover, that in his exposition of the triune God in this work, Augustine "owes very little to the Greek Fathers" or "to his Latin forerunners, Tertullian and Hilary of Poitiers, both of whom were more concerned with upholding materially the doctrine of the Scripture and Tradition than with trying to express it systematically in terms of modern thought."[33]

a. The philosopher to whom Augustine turned for his model of the Trinity was the Neo-Platonist, Marius Victorinus. He blurred the distinction between the "transcendent" and "economic" Trinity and diminished the importance of negative theology for Augustine. Like Plotinos before him, Victorinus "explicitly compares the Life of the Blessed Trinity to the inner life of the soul," a comparison which became fundamental to Augustine's theology. Thanks to Victorinus, the Bishop of Hippo's "Trinitarian doctrine is avowedly philosophical," especially if one considers his return, under the auspices of Marius, to the triads and dyads of Greek thought.[34] Victorinus left to Augustine the principles with which to erect his trinitarianism.

We may, Victorinus said, learn about "the Triad on High" from the soul:

> For as the soul in its 'to be,' gives both life and knowledge, possessing these together, *homoousia*, in unity, before understanding; and

> yet these three are individuated in their own substance without being separated by sectioning, division or overflowing, extension or reproduction; but they are always three, each existing really in the other which truly and substantially exist. Therefore, the soul is 'according to the image.'[35]

Similarly, Augustine wrote:

> Since, then, these three --- memory, understanding and will --- are not three lives, but one; nor three minds but one mind; consequently, neither are there three substances, but one substance. In fact, memory which is called life, mind and substance, is also called this in respect to itself; but memory relative to something else. The same may be said for understanding and will which are called understanding and will relative to something else. Yet, each with respect to itself is life and mind and essence... Therefore, these three are one in that they are one life, one mind, one essence; and whatever they may be called with respect to themselves individually, they are together not many, but one in number.[36]

Victorinus chose as his triad "to be," "to live" and "to understand" --- whereas Augustine conceived the soul, and implicitly God, as "to remember," "to understand" and "to will." The soul, like God, is a single entity despite these three aspects or modes of its being. The soul, like God, is one *substantia* or *essentia* (οὐσία) with three determinations or

existentia (ὑποστάσεις).

When applied to the Trinity, these determinations of the soul produce a certain model of It. Marius introduced Augustine to "the relation of opposites," i.e., the three aspects of the soul (or the three Persons of the Trinity) exist in their peculiar identities only by their difference or opposition to each other. Thus, the Father, Victorinus asserts in *Adversus Arium*, is "the great Divinity" of the Trinity, He Who is differentiated from the other Persons by His activity.[37] The Son is other than the Father "in that He moves Himself and acts for the sake of manifestation." He is "the Logos" Who is moved and moving, the very "principle" (*principium*, ἀρχή) of all things. He eternally rises from the bosom of the Father. The Spirit is "from the Son." "The three are, therefore, *homousioi* and on that account all three are one God."[38]

Thus, the Son and Spirit are *vivicatio autem et intellilgentia in motu* (I, 63 1088A). Both are manifestations of the Father, but the Spirit, in order to distinguish Himself from the Father and the Son, proceeds from both. The Son has "come out of the mouth of the Most High" (Eccl. 24:5).

> Likewise the Holy Spirit is from the Father, because one movement produces each existence; and because 'all that the Father has, He has given to the Son' (John 16:15; 17-10); and, therefore, the latter Who is movement, also gave all to the Holy Spirit, for all that He has 'He has from me' (ib.), He says. To be sure, the Holy Spirit is Himself movement and whatever He has is the result of movement. The

> Son did not give it to the Spirit, but said, 'He has it from me.' Originally, movement is life and life itself is knowledge and awareness; and, therefore, whoever has awareness has it from life. Such is the supreme Trinity and the supreme unity... (*Adv. Ar.* III, 8 1105B).

Here is the very image or idea of the Trinity which Augustine delineates in several treatises on the subject.[39]

He knew exactly what had to be done if his Christian-Hellenic synthesis was to be cogently executed. Augustine was aware of the Tradition which proclaimed the Father "the source of the Trinity" (*fons trinitatis*), the "cause" of the Trinity; but he deliberately altered it. God, he said, is "absolute simplicity,"[40] His being is identical with His Essence. But God is also three Persons --- as compared with Plotinos' impersonal ἕν, νοῦς, πνεῦμα --- a multiplicity which requires reconciliation with Its "simplicity."[41] The solution, as Victorinus contended, was the conversion of the three hypostatic characteristics (paternity, generation, procession) into relationships.[42]

In the divine Society, then, the Father is the "Begetter" or "Cause" of the Son, "but whether the Father is also a beginning relative to the Holy Spirit --- since it is said, 'He proceeds from the Father' --- is no small problem," Augustine confesses. "Because if He is the beginning (*principium*), the Father will be a beginning to that which He begets or makes, but also to that which He gives." His own analysis of the Trinity, Augustine says, requires him to raise the logical

question: since both the Son and the Holy Spirit issue from the Father, why not refer to both of Them as "Sons"?

For Augustine, there is only on way to avoid the confusion of Persons.

> The Spirit, therefore, is both the Spirit of Him Who gave Him and the Spirit of Him Who receives Him. If, then, that which is given has the giver as its principle --- inasmuch as it does not receive from any other source what proceeds from Him --- then, we must admit that the Father and the Son are the principle of the Holy Spirit: one, not two principles; yet the Father and the Son are one Creator and one Lord, so they are one Principle in relation to the creature, the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit are one Principle, as the three are one Creator and Lord.[43]

The Father, then, is not the unique source of the Son and the Spirit. The Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son:

> ...and God the Father is He from Whom the Word is born and from Whom the Holy Spirit principally proceeds (*quo procedit principaliter*). I have used the word 'principally' so that it may be understood that the Spirit proceeds (*procedere*) from the Son also. But the Father gave Him this also, not as to one already existing, although not without it; but whatever He gave to the Only-begotten Word, He gave by generation. But

> He so begat Him that the Spirit, the common Gift, should proceed from Him as well; and thus the Spirit should be the Spirit of Both.[44]

The Spirit is the "gift," the "bond," the "love" between the Father and the Son --- *Qui Spiritus sanctus secundum Scripturas sanctas, nec Patris solius est, nec Filii solius, sed amborum: et ideo communem, qua invicem se deligunt Pater et Filius, nobis insinuat charitatem.*[45]

If, then, the Holy Spirit is the transcendent Love with which the Father and the Son love each other, necessarily the Spirit proceeds from Both.

> ...as the Father has in Himself that the Holy Spirit should proceed from Him, so He has given to the Son that the same Spirit should proceed from Him; and both [processions] apart from time; also, when it is said that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father, we are to understand that His procession comes to the Son from the Father. For if the Son has from the Father whatever He possesses, then, He surely has derived from the Father the Holy Spirit which proceeds from Him.[46]

The procession of the Person of the Spirit from the Person of the Father and the Person of the Son is an intra-Divine relationship and has, in the first instance, nothing to do with the Plan of salvation, that is, the "sanctification" of the creature.

> But the Holy Spirit does not proceed from the Father and into the Son; and then from the Son for the sanctification of the creature; but He

> proceeds from both at the same time, albeit the Father has given to the Son that, as the Holy Spirit proceeds from Himself, so He proceeds from the Son.[47]

We must observe several things about the *filioque*. Augustine failed, however hard he tried, to preserve the traditional role of the Father in the Trinity. Again and again, he insisted that the Spirit is "given" to the Son by the Father; that He "proceeds" from the Father "principally;" that He is a "gift" to the Son from Whom He proceeds both in time and eternity.

Perhaps this is the reason that he not only confused "generation" and "procession,"[48] a distinction by which the Church has traditionally identified the Persons of the Son and the Spirit, but also he seems to have no comprehension of the difference between the procession of the Spirit in eternity and His "mission" through Christ, through the God-Man, in time.[49]

b. To be candid, the Latin Fathers were themselves not always careful to distinguish between the "economic" and "transcendent" Trinity. Many of them, too, used the expression *Spiritus Sanctus procedit a Patre et Filio*. But did they imitate Augustine's error? Clearly, they did not define the Trinity with the same ideology. Moreover, they commonly considered the Trinity in Its relation to the creation, perhaps in deliberate opposition to the Platonic, Arian and Manichean dualists. Also, statements about the "procession" of the Spirit from the Father and the Son are rather declarations of their common Divinity rather than as a theological proposition of the Father and the Son a single *principium*. Finally, let us not dismiss the

possibility that the appearance of the *filioque* in the writings of the West Roman Fathers was the chicanery of medieval editors.

Regarding the last, let us take a few examples. St Ambrose was ostensibly a precursor[50] to Augustine, if only because some Latin manuscripts show that he quoted the Bishop of Milan almost incessantly. We can never be certain, however, that the citations from Ambrose in his writings were not inserted (cf. Migne's *Patrology*) by some over-zealous partisan of Augustine and of Roman Catholicism. One may agree with Father Romanides, moreover, that any honest comparison of their teachings leads to the unavoidable conclusion that Augustine evidently read nothing of Ambrose's theological works.[51]

With regard to their triadologies, that is surely a fair judgment. St Ambrose stated that "the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father, and bears witness to the Son. A witness both faithful and true..."[52] In the same treatise, he wrote that the Holy Spirit "is poured forth from the Mouth of God"; and also, "When the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son, He is not separated from the Father, nor the Son..."[53] The reference here is to the Spirit's "mission" in time, not an eternal procession from the Father.[54]

Turning to St Gregory the Great, the result is the same. He too was not an "Augustinian." In his *Expositionem Beati Job Moralia*, the Saint maintains that the Spirit of the Father and the Son, Who issues from Both, did not appear subsequent to Him (the Son) Whom the Father eternally begets; while the Spririt ever proceeds from the Father --- *et quomodo utrorumque Spiritus utrique coaeternus procedat ostendit.*[55] "The Holy Spirit, Who proceeds from the Father," Gregory

continued, "accepts from the Son what belongs to Him" --- *qui de Patre procedens, et de eo quod est Filii accipiens.*[56] "A sound proceeds from the Mouth of the Lord when His consubstantial Spirit comes to us through the Son" --- *cum consubstantialis ei Spiritus ad nos per Filium veniens.*[57]

"No man," he continues, "has ever possessed simultaneously all the operations of the Holy Spirit, save the Mediator between God and man, Whose Spirit proceeds from the Father before all the ages" --- *nisi solus mediator Dei et hominum cuis est, idem Spiritus, quo de Patre ante saecula procedit.*[58] And because the Lord possesses Him, "Christ imparts to the hearts of His disciples the Holy Spirit Who proceeds from Himself" --- *quia dum sanctum Spiritum qui a se procedit [qui ex se procedit] discipulorum cordibus tribuit.*[59]

Thus, Pope Gregory, commenting on the words of the Lord, "Peace be unto you: as the Father sends Me, so I send you" (John 20:21), writes, "But this mission is the same as the procession by which He proceeds from the Father and the Son; for it is written that the Spirit is sent by Him from Whom He proceeds, and the Spirit is sent by Him Who the Father has begotten" --- *Sed eius missio ipsa processio est qua do Patre procedit et Filio. Sicut itaque Spiritus mitti dicitur quia procedit, ita et Filius non incongrue mitti dicitur quia generatur.*[60]

c. The same kind of analysis could be made of the triadologies formulated by the other West Roman Fathers, and with the same results. Sts Hilary of Poitiers, Jerome, Paulinus of Nola, Nicetas of Remesiana, Leo the Great, Pope Gregory II, etc., all held opinions consistent with the Apostolic

Tradition.[61] None of them abandoned the "monarchy" of the Father, although sometimes they made ambiguous statements in defense of the Holy Spirit's Divinity; hence, Pope Hormisdas insisted that "the Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son in one Substance of Deity" --- *proprium Spiritus sancti ut de Patre et Filio procederet sub una substantia Deitatis*[62] --- which may very well mean that the Spirit is *of the Son* as sharing a common Essence while, in time, He is sent through the Son.

In any case, St Photios (basing himself on the writings of the Frankish theologians) was mistaken when he incredulously accused Sts Ambrose, Jerome, etc. of the *filioque* heresy. He was, nonetheless, correct to denounce the ideology --- the Augustinian ideology --- as an innovation, decrying it as a "new Sabellianism." Photios was also correct to reaffirm that the Person of the Father has been revealed to the Church as "Cause" of the Trinity, while the Person of the Son is distinguished from the Father by His "generation" and the Person of the Spirit by "procession" from the Father. Everything else in the divine Life is held in common, for what belongs to more than one Person belongs to all Three.

The holy Patriarch was also correct to condemn *filioque* trinitarianism as unprecedented. He did not want to believe, however, that it was Augustine who chose to break new ground. Photios was also ignorant of the fact that the Bishop of Hippo believed his novel doctrine of the Blessed Trinity to be the product of special divine illumination.[63] Augustine departed from the Faith of the Church on the basis of his personal insights on God and the soul, insights which in fact came not by divine illumination but by Platonic

dialectics.

4. Wisdom and Being. St Gregory of Nyssa

According to Augustine, divine illumination conditions the human mind, enhancing its powers by which it has access to higher spiritual truths. It acquires insight into matters which would be otherwise closed to us. The divine (created) light enables a person to know what is unknown to the unenlightened.[64] The knowing faculties are purified and strengthened by the light.[65]

Such opinions are premised on the equation of the human mind with the *imago Dei*; it is the analogy of the eternal *Imago Dei*. Thus, by virtue of that similarity, of its spiritual and immaterial nature, the mind is able to understand and behold God --- *ac per hoc si secundum hoc facta est ad imaginem Dei quod uti ratione atque intellectu ad intelligendum et conpisciendum Deum potest.*[66] More specifically, "the image of the Image of God" means that the mind possesses by analogy what belongs naturally to the divine Wisdom, that is, the eternal Ideas. Like Plato, Augustine believed that a human duplicate of the Ideas was impressed by God on the mind as a signet ring on soft wax.[67]

Chief among those innate human ideas (*notitia, impressa*) is the idea of God, the regulative idea by which we are able to identify and choose the good.[68] Unlike the pagan Greeks, however, Augustine did not consider the Ideas, whether of the Good or of anything else, to be independent, super-celestial forces. Aside from their evolutionary power in Nature, he spoke of the Incarnate Lord as the treasury of the Ideas, Christ Himself the supreme Form of all things.[69]

Are we to believe that the alteration Augustine made in Plato's Ideas implies that he was not a Platonist? Not any more than his rejection of Plotinos' identification of God with the One denies him the proud name of Neo-Platonist. Whatever changes he made in Greek metaphysics, he made them for the sake of his ambitious religio-philosophical synthesis. His dependence on the Platonic tradition was not superficial, as it was among the Church Fathers.

a. According to Augustine, we need only look at the *notitia* in the human mind and the divine Ideas in the Logos to understand their connection. The former are ectypes of the latter. The evidence for this doctrine was very clear to him.

Augustine discovered in Plotinos' "Father of lights" (*Enn.* VI, vii, 29) an equivalent of James 1:17 --- "Every good gift and every perfect gift is from above and comes down from the Father of lights." The "light" of which they speak --- for the Greek an uncreated light, for Augustine created --- is the light by which the soul is empowered to transcend the realm of ordinary human experience. With the "light," we may "know" God. "Our illumination is the participation in the Word, namely in that Life which is the light of men," Augustine declared.[70]

Illumined, the mind perceives "the pattern which governs our being and our activities," he adds, "whether in ourselves or in regard to eternal things, according to the rule of truth and of right reason."[71] That "pattern" is not only the key to the comprehension of things spiritual, but also to the understanding of the temporal world --- a dualism he borrowed *mutatis mutandis* from Plato. The immateriality of the soul and the *notitia* of its mind give man the ability to

overcome the gulf between God and the world He formed. They also give the soul the machinery to interpret the manifold of sense-perceptions which impact on the body.[72]

Although it is true that the mind is not dependent on the world of phenomena for all its knowledge --- and certainly not the knowledge of intelligible things --- Augustine conceived the material world as a hazy copy of the κόσμος νοητός. Indeed, all phenomena are but contingent ektypes of the eternal Ideas. Again, since there are some created and material things superior to others and some things below which more greatly resemble things above, Augustine's universe is a hierarchy or ladder of beings leading to Him Who is the Supreme Being. The ascent to God begins with a "turning" to Him, a "turning" which necessarily involves divine illumination.[73] Of course, the limitation of our ascent is not merely the limitation of our created nature, but also the result of our moral and spiritual condition.

At this point, Augustine introduces his version of the Platonic ἀνάμνησις (memory or remembrance), minus the pagan mythology of the soul's pre-existence and transmigration. "Memory," he said, is the soul's ability to recall the past, perhaps the racial past, the personal past, upon which the mind may draw, the bringing forward what has been stored within our being. The faculty of memory or "re-membrance" is the result of probing and questioning, much in the same way that Socrates elicited knowledge from the slave-boy in the *Meno*. To put the theory in the language of modern epistemology --- which owes much to Augustine --- memory is the storehouse of knowledge which, with the intellect's *a priori* categories (*notitia*), brings the

truth of the world external to it.

Memory is the *sine qua non* of all knowledge, whether intellectual or sensory. The intellect, unlike the senses, is fed by two streams: from the soul and, indirectly, from the world of phenomena. The intellect, stamped or "impressed" with the divine Ideas, beckons us to contemplate the soul and the heavenly realm to which it is akin. When the intellect or reason concerns itself with the physical world, it produces "science" (*scientia*); but when it searches the realm of the spirit, it uncovers "wisdom" (*sapientia*). Inasmuch as both *scientia* and *sapientia* comprehend some aspect of the truth, they both, to some degree, require illumination. The higher we ascend on the scale of being, the greater the "light" given to the soul.

What are the implications of this Augustinian epistemology for Christian doctrine? It may indeed leave room for divine revelation, although Fr Romandies may be right in saying that Augustine confuses "revelation and the conceptual intuition of revelation."[74] We ought, also, to ask with Frederick Copelston, "If the human mind beholds the exemplar ideas and eternal truths, and if these ideas and truths are in the Mind of God, does it not follow that the human mind beholds the Essence of God, since the divine Mind, with all that it contains, is ontologically identical with the divine Essence?"[75] Has Augustine fallen into the heresy of Eunomios?

Also, his theory of knowledge (including his notion of "illumination") has soteriological (see footnote 73) and ecclesiological implications. If nothing else, it strongly suggests that personal experience of the Divine --- which may or may not be a Christian experience --- is superior to and different

from the collective knowledge and experience of the Church. Where in the Scriptures is such a theory to be discovered? Where in the holy Fathers or where in the history of the Orthodox Church do we find the idea that God imparts knowledge to the creature, however virtuous, outside of or contrary to the doctrine of the Church? Augustinianism implies even more. We shall see in the following chapters what further comprises his arsenal of "special wisdom."

b. Augustine should have imitated the other "Christian Platonist" with whom he is sometimes favorably compared by his Orthodox admirers: *St Gregory of Nyssa* (335-394?). In fact, it might be helpful to examine the use he made of Platonism if only to show the lack of validity in such a comparison.

I concur with the late Cardinal Jean Danielou that Gregory was not a "Platonist," not even in its Origenist form.[76] Furthermore, that, unlike Augustine, the "Platonism" of the Saint loses its peculiar character in his theology, a theology which ought to be judged by its Christian presuppositions and motifs rather the philosophical "elements" which embroider it.

For St Gregory "the Platonic chariot" is an intellectual discipline and a mode of communication. He did not need it to prove what he believed. "The Church," he once wrote, "has the means to explain these things; she has faith which is more certain than any kind of [philosophical] demonstration."[77] As he stated numerous times, he stood on the teachings of the Church and employs for her defense only those Greek "speculations" (περιλοσοφωτηκότων) which fully "harmonize" (συμφωνοῦντας) with them. He will do nothing to prejudice "our philosophy" --- τῆς καθ' ἡμᾶς φιλοσοφίας.[78] "Our philosophy" is the whole scope of

Christian doctrine --- ὁ κατὰ φιλοσοφίαν βιός --- and *a fortiori* Christian asceticism.[79]

Consequently, the knowledge of being is not the supreme end of Gregory's religion.[80] The *raison d'etre* of Christianity, according to the Bishop of Nyssa, is man's union with God and the transfiguration of the cosmos. Knowledge serves life and life virtue and "the end of the life of virtue is to become like God" --- ἡ πρὸς τὸ θεῖον ὁμοίωσις.[81] Again, the "knowledge" of which Gregory speaks is the knowledge of good and evil, of those spiritual realities which cannot be safely approached without righteousness, achieved only by our choice of the good. Plato made the same observation (*Rep.* X, 618BC), but, albeit grateful to the philosopher for his support, the source of Gregory's opinion is the Scriptures.

The knowledge of good is always the knowledge of being; but being, whether sensible or noetical, is created. His "dualistic cosmology" is a common reason given for his description as a Platonist. That accusation is easily dispelled when it is understood that St Gregory's (the Christian) "dualism" is mitigated; it is a *monoduality*, that is, he denied the eternity of anything but God Who alone can bridge the gulf between the visible and the invisible. And, incidentally the separation between Creator and creature is not overcome by the use of created intermediaries, as Philo thought.

Gregory clearly states that Creator and creature as well as the material and spiritual dimensions of created reality possess "a certain harmony (τις ἁρμονία) which gives creation its unity (συμφωνία τῆς κτίσεως)," "a mixture and penetration" (μίξις τε καὶ ἀνάκρασις) which not even the contrariety of spirit and

matter may separate.[82] There is, of course, higher and lower being and the spiritual is superior to the material, but they are not anithetical but everything has a place in the "economy" of the universe.

Thus, being ranges from the incorporeal (e.g., angels, demons, etc.) to the corporeal or material (e.g., rocks, water, etc.); and man who is "microcosm." The greater the materiality of a being the less its spiritual content and, therefore, the lower it stands on the scale of beings. God, however, Who transcends all being, is utterly immaterial and incomprehensible. He can be known only if He reveals Himself --- through His Uncreated Energies or incognito, such as walking with Adam in Paradise, or appearing to Abraham in the form of an angel or speaking to Moses in the Burning Bush, coming to the prophets in a dream; or assuming a genuine body and becoming true man through the Ever-Virgin Mary and the Holy Spirit.

Outside of His revelation, God cannot be known and "the power of words cannot describe the unspeakable and incomprehensible Nature" --- τοῦτο πάσα δυνάμις λόγων πρὸς τὴν ἄφαστον καὶ ἀπεπιλήπτον φύσιν.[83] Names are applicable either to His Energies or to His manifestations. Only in these, His actions and theophanies, may God be called "good" or "merciful" or "loving," etc. Otherwise, God is *Deus absconditus* and every concept of Him is a simulacrum, an idol. Ideas of God hide Him; they never disclose Him.[84]

St Gregory's theology, unlike Augustine's, is negative; yet, the apophaticism of the first is not dependent on the "negative theology" of Plotinos, while the cataphaticism of Augustine is a modification, an important modification of it. If St Gregory understands God as beyond all being (ὑπερούσιος), his

reasoning is not philosophical, but traditional. Indeed, it is futile to look to Neo-Platonism or any Greek philosophy for his theology when the Faith of the Orthodox Church is the best and most apparent source.

Long before St Gregory, the Apostle said that God alone is immortal by nature and dwells in "inapproachable Light" (I Tim. 6:16); and He alone is "immaterial" (ἄϋλος) and nothing may be compared to Him. What is more, the "mind" comes to the "knowledge" of God not by virtue of some analogy between the Creator and the human soul, but because that "knowledge" is implanted in human nature by Him and only lost by the corruption of that nature.

We recover that knowledge through dispassion and reconciliation with God --- through grace, if you will. Only in that experience is the relationship between the Creator and the created personally certified; or, to be more accurate, we "know" who God is only in Christ Who has opened the way to fellowship with the Trinity. The soul, through meditation (θεωρια) and dispassion (απαθεια) rises to the realm of the spirit. There God is apprehended with a knowledge of the "inner man," a "knowledge" (γνῶσις) of the spirit cleansed by faith and crowned by "love" (ἀγάπη).[85] Whatever its ordinary and natural functions, the supreme task of reason (διανοία) is to "guard the heart" against evil images, to discriminate between good and evil.[86] In a word, St Gregory had no theory of eternal Ideas[87] nor their *notitia*.

Above all, St Gregory does not equate "the image of God" with the intellectual faculties of man; but rather defines the *imago Dei* as that aspect of human nature which fits it for participation "in all good," and "if the Deity is the fullness of good and this is

His Image, then, the human image (εἰκών) finds its resemblance to the Archetype in being filled with goodness."[88] Gregory instructs us that it is a "resemblance" restored to its "original grace" by Christ through Whom comes faith and dispassion.[89]

On the basis of this attitude towards the soul, one finds in his writings no demonstration of the Trinity from the nature of the soul. Rather St Gregory provides a more conventional explanation:

> The Holy Spirit by His uncreatedness holds communion (κοινωνίαν) with the Father and the Son, but is distinguished from Them by those things which give each His peculiar identity. His special properties are those which we contemplate in neither the Father nor the Son. He is neither uncaused nor only-begotten. Joined to the Father by His uncreatedness, the Spirit is distinguished from Him as not being the Father. He is joined to the Son by virtue of the same uncreatedness while, at the same time, deriving His Existence from the God of all (καὶ ἐν τῷ τὴν αἰτίαν τῆς ὑπάρξεως ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ τῶν ὅλων). The Spirit differs from the Son by lacking the property of generation while also being manifested through the Son.[90]

The expression "being manifested through the Son" is significant. It is employed by St Gregory in the context of his argument against Eunomios, that is to say, in reference to the activity of the Triune God within the creation. More exactly, in the *ad extra* activity of the Persons, the Spirit is "manifested through" the Son (as the Spirit discloses the Son) while the Father reveals Himself to the world in the

Son.[91] As we shall see, Augustine understood the distinction between the "procession" and the "manifestation" of the Persons differently from the Fathers.

FOOTNOTES

1. Eusebios of Caesarea recalled that Origen "was always studying the writings of Plato, and had in his hands the works also of Numenios and Kronios, of Apollophanes, Longinos, Moderatos, Nichomachos, and others whose writings he valued. He also read the works of Chaeremon the Stoic and those of Kronutos. From these he derived the allegorical method of Scriptural interpretation, a method commonly applied by the Greeks to the mysteries and the Jewish Scriptures" (*Eccl. Hist.* VI, 19 PG 20 565-568). Origen was a Middle Platonist.

2. See my "The Greek Fathers: *Polis* and *Paideia*," *St Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* XXII, 1-2 (1979), 3-21; 67-86.

3. "Neo-Platonism" to describe the philosophy of Plotinos (204-270) and his disciples originated in the 19th century. Throughout the history of philosophy to that time, Plotinos *cum sui* were simply known as *Platoni*, the same word Augustine used to identify them. Plotinos thought of himself as a "Platonist."

4. Switalski, B., *Plotinus and the Ethics of Augustine*, New York, 1946, p. 88.

5. Portalié concedes that Augustine *"transforme encore davantage le Catholicisme pour la mettre d'accord avec philosophie Plotinienne et elle ne le considere que comme une forme inferieure de la sagasse, bonne seulement pour les intelligences faibles ou encore novices"* ("Saint Augustine," *Dict. Cath.*, 515). A standard Roman Catholic work on Augustine, Fr Charles Boyer's *Christianisme et Neo-Platonisme dans la formation de Saint Augustin* (Paris, 1920) rejects the fundamental importance of Neo-Platonism to Augustine's teachings. J.J. O'Meara, in the Introduction to his translation of Augustine's *Contra Academicos* (New York, 1951, p.

21) observes that Boyer reduces Augustine's Neo-Platonism "almost to the vanishing point." O'Meara agrees with Boyer that Augustine accepted the Church's authority on the Trinity, the Incarnation and the Sacraments, but "to Neoplatonism he looked for the rational explanation of everything else. He wished not merely to believe but to understand" (ibid., p. 22).

6. *De Civ. Dei.* X, 1 PL 41 277..

7. In the last period of his life, Augustine referred to "the Platonists" less and less. In his *De Retractiones*, he repudiated "some Platonists," particularly Porphyry (233-304) for his polemic, *Adversus Christianos*. There is no proof (for Augustine's suggestion) that Porphyry was an apostate Christian. See footnote 23 below.

8. The words "God made nothing without reason," if not simply false, are a misleading play on words. Of course, Augustine may have been alluding to the *rationes seminales* (which he adopted from Platonism); or perhaps, he drew some inference from the *analogia entis*. More will be said on this matter.

9. *Ep. CXX ad Cons.*, 2 PL 33 453.

10. *De Trin.* XV, ii, 2 PL 42 1058.

11. As we shall see, Augustine did not believe that reason, without divine assistance, could discover spiritual and transcendent truth; but, then, neither did Plotinos (*Enneads* V, iii, 8-9). Plato said that the true philosopher is "possessed of a deity" (*Phaedrus*, 249d). Augustine also held the notion that "certain books of the Platonists were inspired" (See *Conf.* VII, 13, 26-27; trans. by E.B. Pusey, New York, 1950).

12. "The Relation of Philosophy to Faith in the Teaching of St Augustine," in *Studia Patristica* II, p. 292.

13. Greek philosophy, wrote St Gregory Palamas, is

given for our understanding of natural things --- τις τῷ φυσικὴν εἶναι τὴν φιλοσοφίαν ἐκ θεοῦ δεδόσθαι (*Defense des saints hesychastes* [vol. 1]. Greek text with Intro. by J. Meyendorff. Louvain, 1959, I, i. 19). Some Fathers were less optimistic concerning "Greek wisdom." About St Athanasios, for instance, it is said that he "briefly studied pagan literature and philosophy that he might not be completely unskilled in those subjects or unlearned in those matters he was prepared to despise" (St Gregory Nazianzus, *Ora.* XXI, 6 PG 35 1088D).

14. I do not refer merely to the East Roman Fathers. Augustine is the only Christian writer of the Orthodox West to emprise the construction of a "Christian philosophy." Concerning Sts Hilary of Poitiers and Ambrose of Milan --- both of whom knew the Greek language well --- Etienne Gilson says: *"Hilaire savait le grec, et il ne s'est pas laissé tenter par la métaphysique; Ambroise savait grec, il a longuement étudié Philo et Origené... mais il ne s'est pas non plus laissé entrainer au moindre approfondissement métaphysique du text sacre...announce parois le invectives...contra dialectique"* (*La Philosophie au Moyen Age*, Paris, 1944, 11-20).

15. *Défense* I, i, 10. The Archbishop of Thessalonica asserts that the λατινέλληνως of Barlaam belongs to the Church's list of heresies (see epilogue to volume 2 of *Défense* III, , 16).

16. Neither does Palamas equate the *imago Dei* with the intellect --- οἱ φάσιν ἐκ τῆς γνώσεως τὸ κατ' εἰκόνα τὸν ἄνθρωπον λαμβάνειν καὶ δι' αὐτῆς κατὰ θεοῦ μορφοῦσθαι τὴν ψυχήν (*Défense* I, , 20) --- as Augustine taught. Furthermore, access to divine things comes not by "the mere enlightenment of conceptual images," writes St Symeon Metaphrastes, but "by the true and unceasing effulgence of God's own light into the soul." It is the "light" which "corporeal eyes cannot bear (Cf. Acts 9:8)"; it is the means by which "spiritual knowledge is revealed and God is truly known by the worthy and loving soul" (*Paraphrases of the Homilies of St Makarios of Egypt*, in *The Philokalia* [vol. 3], trans. and ed. by G.E.H. Palmer, P. Sherrard, T. Ware, London, 1984, VI, 138-139).

17. *The City of God* XI, 26 (trans. by M. Dods. New York, 1950).

18. Several decades ago, Paul Henry undertook once more to indicate passages from the *Enneads*, often paraphrased, in Augustine's *City of God* and *Confessions* (*Plotin et l'occident: Firmicus Maternus, Marius Victorinus, St Augustin et Microbe*, Louvain, 1934, 104-137). Henry wanted also to show Augustine's relation, in the above mentioned works, to Porphyry.

19. *Plotinus and the Ethics of Augustine*, p. 88.

20. Lossky, *The Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church*, p. 33.

21. *Coll. XIII*, 17 PL 49 943C-944A.

22. Quoted in J. Hussey, *Church and Learning in the Byzantine Empire*, London, 1963, p. 95. On the subject of Hellenism and Christian education, see St Basil, *Sermo de Legendis Gentilium*; and St Gregory the Theologian, *In Laudem Basilii Magni*; and the 12th book of St Hilary of Poitiers' *De Trinitate*.

23. In his *Retractiones* (I, i, 2), Augustine blamed himself for praising the "Platonists" beyond measure. He alluded to the school of Porphyry as "the impious Platonists." Otherwise he spoke of Plato, Plotinos, Victorinus, etc. with the utmost respect and never contradicted them without courtesy (P. Henry, "Augustine and Plotinos," *Journal of Theological Studies* XXXVIII [1937], 20-21).

24. The idea first appears in *De beata vita* I, 4 PL 32 961. This shows the influence of Plotinos (*Enn.* II, ix 3; V, v, 4), according to S.J. Grabowski ("St Augustine and the Presence of God," *Theological Studies* VIII [1952], 338).

25. Henry Chadwick writes that Exodus 3:14 ("I am that I am") assured Augustine "that God is never beyond being... He is being itself, *ipsum esse*: that

which truly is" (*St Augustine*, p. 31).

26. Augustine said that it is because God is the Good that we exist --- *quia Deus bonus est, sumus* (*De doct. Christ.* I, 32). The proper name of God, he says, is Being and, therefore, all created being is good. As the Scripures declared, "And God saw everything that He had made and, behold, it was very good" (Gen. 1:31). All being is good and God is the Supreme Being (*The City of God*, X, 16). Moreover, qualities (such as "goodness") are predicated of God substantially, not relatively, that is, of His Essence (*De Trin.* XV, v, 7-8 PL 42 1059).

27. Plato's first principles (αρχαι) of "creation" --- the temporal sphere --- are the Ideas by which it was formed. Plotinos added a doctrine of emanations which Augustine rejected (See F. Copelston, *A History of Philosophy* [vol. 2]: *Medieval Philosophy* [pt. I]: *Augustine to Bonaventura*, Garden City [NY], 1962, pp. 66-82).

28. *De Gen. ad litt.* V, xv, 33 PL 34 332-333. Cf. *Sunt namque ideae principales formae quaedam, vel rationes rerum stabiles atque incommutabiles quae ipsae formatae non sunt, ac per hoc aeternae ac semper eodem modo sese habentes, quia divina intelligentia contentur* (*De div. Quaest. oct.*, q. 46, 2 PL 40 30).

29. *Ep.* XIV, 4 PL 33 80. Cf. Marius Victorinus, "God, I say, begot the existence and common substance of universals. Plato called them 'Ideas', the original principle of things" (*Adv. Ar.* IV, 5 PL 8 1116C).

30. "The Notion of Nature in Augustine," in *Studia Patristica* II, 180.

31. Taylor, J.H., ed. & trans., *St Augustine: The Literal Meaning of Genesis* [vol. I], in *Ancient Christian Writers* (vol. 41), New York, 1982, p. 9).

32. *Augustinische Studien*, 190. Reuter admits, however, that in his other works, Augustine consults the Nicean Creed (185).

33. "The *Adversus Arium* of Marius Victorinus," *Journal of Theological Studies* I (1950), 42. Reuter (*op.cit.*, 192) makes very much the same point. Augustine, he writes, did not utilize the Greek Fathers to any great extent for several reasons: his Greek was poor and because he thought them "too rigid." In truth, neither were the Latin Fathers authorities for him. Augustine claimed to have imbibed *De fide* and *De Spiritu Sancto* of St Ambrose, but, Reuter adds that Augustine *"von denen doch kaum anzunehmen ist, dass er sie nicht sollte gekannt haben, irgendwie also Quelle benutz habe."*

34. "*The Adversus Arium...*," 42, 54.

35. *Adv. Ar.* I, 63 PL 8 1087D.

36. *De Trin.* X, ix, 18 983. The image of the Trinity on the mind, Augustine said, is triune. "The mind itself and love and the intellect are three, but the three are one; and when they are perfect, they are equal" --- *Igitur ipsa mens et amor et notitia eius tria quaedam sunt, et haec tria unum sunt, et cum perfecta sunt aequalia sunt* (*De Trin.* IX, iv, 4 963). Cf. Plotinos, *Enn.* III, viii, 11; and Plato, *Tim.*, 37D, 41D-42D.

37. *Letter to Candidus the Arian* V, 2, 30 (in *Marius Victorinus: Theological Treatises on the Trinity*, trans. by M.T. Clark for *Fathers of the Church* [vol. 69], Washington D.C., 1981).

38. *Adv. Ar.* I, 8 1044D.

39. Augustine developed his triadology in *De Trinitate* (400-416), *In evangelium Johannis tractus* (416-417) and *Contra Maximum Arianorum* (428). He, like Victorinus, also used loose translations of the Scriptures.

40. *...ideo simplex dicitur, quoniam quod habet, hoc est... Propter hoc itaque natura dicitur simplex, cui non sit alquid habere, quod vel possit amittere, vel aliud sit habens, aliud quod habens,*

aliud quod habet (*De Civ. Dei* XI, 10, PL 41 325-326).

41. See the Fifth *Ennead*.

42. Consult Vladimir Lossky, *The Mystical Theology of the Church*, 55-66.

43. *De Trin.* V, xiv, 15 921.

44. *De Trin.* XV, xvi, 29 1081. The Orthodox defenders of Augustine (See Chap. Ie) attach great significance to his distinction between *procedit principaliter* and *procedere*. According to their argument, the Greek Fathers produced theological language to accommodate "principal procession" and mere "procession" of the Spirit. The equivalent to the first is the conventional εκπορευσις while the matching Greek word for the second is the ἔκλαμψις of St Athanasios the Great or the προχεῖται of St Cyril of Alexandria. Some have suggested that Augustine's *nulli debere sed Patre* (*De fid. et symb.*, 19, PL 40 191) corresponds to the ἐκ μόνου τοῦ πατρός of the Greek Fathers (V. Rodzianko, "*Filioque* in Patristic Thought," *Studia Patristica* II, 22-27). Often Augustine is exonerated by an appeal to the Latin Fathers who, it is believed, espoused the "double procession" of the Spirit. We are, therefore, asked to condemn the entire West Roman theology --- which is, of course, nonsense --- or affirm the Orthodoxy of Augustine. Thus, his errors, if any, must be explained in terms of language and culture. The apology fails on several counts.

First, the defenders of Augustine seek to build a case for his Orthodoxy rather than letting the Bishop of Hippo speak for himself. Second, they ignore the philosophical background of his theology. Third, the theological vocabulary of the Fathers has a context of its own and it is intellectually dishonest to force that vocabulary into a framework alien to it. Fourth, Augustine's apologists pass over numerous passages in his works in which he simply denied the monarchy of God the Father. Fifth, Augustine showed the greatest indifference to the distinction between the "economic" and "transcendent Trinity." Finally, there is much evidence that he was outside the the theological tradition of the Latin

Fathers.

45. *De Trin.* XV, xvii, 27 1080.

46. *Ibid.*,, XV, xxiv, 47 1094.

47. *Ibid.*, XV, xxvii, 48 1095-1096. To the question: why does the Evangelist say that the Holy Spirit "proceeds from the Father" (John 15:26), Augustine replied: "Why else do you think, except that He [Christ] usually referred even what was His to the Father, He from Whom He also comes?... He from Whom the Son has His Deity (for He is God of God), but it is also true that the Holy Spirit proceeds from Him, and therefore, He also proceeds from the Father. He also proceeds from the Son as He proceeds from the Father" --- *ac per hoc Spiritus sanctus ut etiam de Filio procedat, sicut procedit de Patre, ab ipso habet Patre* (*De Trin.* XV, xxvii, 48 1095).

48. As other Platonists --- in particular, Porphyry --- the Bishop of Hippo converted the Persons into philosophical abstractions. "And what he [Porphyry] as a Platonist means by 'principles', we know. For he speaks of God the Father and God the Son, Whom he calls (writing in Greek) the intellect or mind of the Father; but of the Holy Spirit, he says nothing or nothing plainly; for I do not understand of what other he speaks as holding the middle place between the Two. For, if like Plotinos in his discussion regarding the three principle substances (*Enn.* V, 1), he wished to understand this Third as the Soul of the World, he would certainly not have given it the middle place between the Two, that is, between the Father and the Son. For Plotinos places the Soul of the World after the Intellect of the Father, while Porphyry, making it the mean, does not place it after, but between the others. No doubt he spoke according to his light, or as he thought expedient; but we assert the Holy Spirit is the Spirit not of the Father only, nor the Son alone, but of Both..." (*The City of God* X, 23).

49. Although Augustine recognized the "mission" of the Spirit in time, he attached no peculiar significance to it. He was motivated by rational

necessity, "to a category of Aristotelian logic, that of relation" (Vladimir Lossky, *The Mystical Theology...*, p. 54).

50. Augustine consciously broke with the Fathers. "Concerning the Holy Spirit," he wrote, "learned and distinguished exegetes of the Scriptures have not offered a complete and careful examination of the subject, an intelligent discourse which allows us to clearly determine His special individuality, an individuality that precludes any confusion with the Persons of the Father and the Son. These teachers hold that divine generation is not predicated of the Spirit, but of the Son born of the Father; for only Christ is begotten. Nor is the Spirit begotten of the Son, like a grandson of the Supreme Father. They affirm rather that the Spirit owes what He is to the Father alone from Whom are all things (*nec tamen id quod est, nulli debere, sed Patri ex quo omnia*), lest we establish in the Trinity two principles without principle (*ne duo constituamus principia sine principio*), which is most false and absurd, an idea peculiar to heretics, not to the Catholic Faith" (*De fid. et symb.* IX, 19 PL 40 191).

Curious is the fact that Augustine does not identify the "learned and distinguished exegetes" as Fathers of the East or West. Listen to the words of St Photios concerning the Trinity: "...if one admits of two causes in the divinely sovereign and super-essential Trinity, where then is the much hymned and God-befitting majesty of the monarchy? Will not the godlessness of polytheism be introduced? Under the guise of Christianity will not the superstition of the Greek error reassert itself among those who dare to say such things?..." "Nor must the fact be overlooked that this impious teaching divides into two even the hypostasis of the Father; or in any case, certainly legislates that the Person of the Son subsumes some part of the Father's hypostasis. For if, as was said, the Father is the cause of the Persons issuing from Him by reason of the hypostasis and not by reason of nature, and if the Son is also the cause of the Spirit, as the enemies of God proclaim, then it must be conceded that either the Son shares in the Father's hypostasis, from which He receives the property of causation, or the Son supplements the person of the Father; and this last is tantamount to

audaciously saying that before the supplementation, the Father was defective. Since the Son is become part of the Father, the awesome mystery of the Trinity is truncated into a duality" (*On the Mystagogy of the Holy Spirit*, trans. by Holy Transfiguration Monastery, New York,1983, 11, 16).

Let us conclude with the remarks of Cyriaque Lampryllos --- *"Nous pouvons d'abord établir comme thèse irrefutable, qu'on ne trouve chez aucun des Pères et anciens Docteurs de l'Eglise d'Occident un témoignage clairment exprimé nous indiquant que le Saint-Esprit procède du Père et du Fils, dans le sens d'une procession éternelle qu'on ne trouve, dis-je, aucun témoignage de ce genre, avant le cinquième siecle, comme saint Augustine l'attest lui-même..."* (*La Mystification Fatale: Etude Orthodoxe sur le Filioque*, Lausanne, 1987, 116-117).

51. "The Filioque," p. 287.

52. *De Spir. Sanct.* I, i, 25 PL 16 739B.

53. *Ibid.*, I, viii, 97 757A; and I, xi, 120 762C-763C.

54. The Roman Catholic writer, P. Altaner, agrees that when St Ambrose wrote *Spiritus sanctus procedit a Patre et Filio*, he equated *procedere* here with *missio ad extra* (*Patrology*, trans. by H.C. Graef, New York, 1964, p. 452).

55. *Moralia* XXX, 17 PL 76 534A.

56. *Ibid.*, V, 65 PL 75 715A.

57. *Ibid.*, XXVII, 34 PL 76 419B.

58. *Ibid.*, XXIX, 74 PL 76 519B. Some medieval manuscripts have: *Constat quia Paracletus Spiritus a Patre semper procedat et Filio.*

59. *Ibid.*, XXII, 30 PL 75 541B.

60. *Hom. in Evang.* XXVI, 2 PL 76 1198C.

61. *A Patre procedit Spiritus veritatis; a Filio mittitur, et Filio accipit* (St Hilary of Poitiers, *De Trin.* VII, 26 PL 10 255B); *et Spiritus sanctus proprie et vere de Patre procedit* (St Jerome, *Ep. XVII ad Cyril.*, 3 PL 30 179); *Sola Dei natura Deus: quod Filius et quod Spiritus, et Pater est: sed Filius ex Patre natus, Spiritus et Patre procedens* (St Paulinus of Nola, *Poem* XIX, 140 PL 61 521A); *Sufficit itaque fidelibus hoc scire quia Filius genitus est, Spiritus autem de Patre procedens est* (St Nicetas Remesiana, *De Spir. sanct. Pot.*, 5 PL 52 856A); and *Spiritus sanctus a Patre vero, medianti Filio* (St Pope Gregory II, *Ep. ad Germ.*, PG 98 1020A). On St Leo the Great, see footnote 62.

62. *Ep. LXXIV ad Just. Aug.* PL 63 414B. St Leo says very much the same thing. "For in the divine Trinity nothing is unlike or unequal, and all that may be thought of Its divine Substance admits no diversity, whether of power or glory or eternity. And while the property of each Person is Its own, one of the Father, one of the Son and one of the Holy Spirit, yet there is no distinction or difference within the divine Nature. Although the Son is only-begotten of the Father, the Holy Spirit is the Spirit of the Father and the Son, but as living and having power within Both, as eternally sharing the subsistence of the Father and the Son" --- *sed sicut cum utroque vivens et potens et sempiterne ex eo quod est Pater Filiusque subsistens* (*Serm.* LXXV, 3 PL 54 402). The three Persons of the Trinity possess all things in common, save what defines them as Persons. St Leo does not interpret the Lord's words, "All things that the Father has are mine" (John 16:12) as signifying the Spirit as the common possession of the Father and the Son; nor are They the common Source of the Spirit; rather, he says, "all things which the Father has, likewise the Son and the Spirit have; nor was there a time when this communion did not exist... There is no diversity of substance, power, will or operation" (*l.c.*). Here is not an untypical West Roman response to to Arianism: stressing the common Substance or Essence of the Three Persons.

63. "For Augustine there is no distinction between

revelation and the conceptual intuition of revelation," contends Fr Romanides. "Whether revelation is given directly to human reason, or to human reason by means of the creature, or created symbols, it is always the human intellect itself which is being illumined or given vision. The vision of God itself is an intellectual experience even though above the powers of reason without appropriate grace" ("The Filioque," p. 298).

64. *De Trin.* IV, ii, 4 PL 42 889.

65. "Illumination," writes R.A. Markus, is "fundamentally" a "statement completely in terms of what Augustine considers the ultimate ground of the possibility for rational knowledge, that is, God's ultimate presence to the human mind: God is in the mind as He is in everything, and His presence is the condition not only of its being, but its functioning in the ways proper to its being" ("Augustine: Reason and Illumination," in *The Cambridge Medieval Philosophy*, ed. by A.H. Armstrong, Cambridge [Eng.]. 1967, p. 368).

66. *De Trin.* XIV, iv, 6 1040.

67. See *Parmenides*, 123d-133d.

68. *De Trin.* VIII, iii, 949.

69. *De ver. rel.* XXXVI, 66 PL 34 152. Pertinent are the remarks of R.H. Nash that Augustine's dependency on Plato is evident from the fact that the Bishop of Hippo equated the Idea or Form of the Good with Plato's God, a suggestion first made by Xenophon and later repeated by the Middle Platonists (the school of Origen). "Or, if this is too strong," Nash adds, "it is certainly true that the position that the Good occupied in Plato's system is filled in Augustine's philosophy by God" ("Some Philosophical Sources of Augustine's Illumination Theory," *Augustinian Studies* II [1952], 59).

70. *...illuminatio quippe nostra participatione Verbi est, illius scilicet vitae qua lux est hominum* (*De*

Trin. IV, ii, 4 889). Augustine also recognized an uncreated Light in which God dwells, but it is incommunicable (*Contra Faust.* XXII, 8 PL 42 404).

71. *De Trin.* IX, vii, 12 967.

72. When Augustine "converted" to Platonism, he adopted its ontological dualism, the bifurcation of "the intelligible world where the truth is, and the visible world which we perceive by sense and sight" --- *Platonem senisse duo esse mundos: unum intelligibilem in quo ipsa veritas habitaret; istum autem sensibilem, quem manifestum est nos visu tactuque sentire* (*Contra Acad.* III, xvii, 37 PL 32 954). On becoming a Christian, he would modify his Platonism in order to accommodate his version of *creatio ex nihilo*. Yet, his theory of knowledge, cast into Platonic moulds of thinking, would not permit Augustine to abandon his "nestorian" dualism. To the end of his life, he maintained the existence of two radically different worlds in which the only demonstrable connection between them was the "manifestation" of the higher in the lower (See *Retract.* I, iii, 2 PL 32 589).

73. Augustine did not address certain important questions: Is "illumination" after the Advent of Christ given only to the "elect"? (Apparently not, because he believed the "Platonists" to be "enlightened" and "inspired"). Is "illumination" the companion of their "faith"? Is the difference between pagan "philosophical faith" and "saving faith" a matter of degree? If, on the other hand, "illumination" is given only to those who love the God of Israel, believers who achieve purity of heart, how is it that unbelievers know Him? Do the "elect" have a greater "light" than those predestined to eternal punishment? Why do the reprobate need such light at all? How and why do the damned love God and attain to the goodness of soul by which to possess the knowledge of God and of spiritual things?

74. See footnote 63.

75. *A History of Philosophy* (vol. 2), p. 75.

76. *Platonisme et Théologie mystique: Essai sur la Doctrine Spirituelle Grégoire de Nysse*, Paris, 1944. St Gregory did not advocate the Greek idea of "the restoration of all things" (αποκαταστασις). He did not "preach like the Origenists that all men return to God after a temporary punishment, to what they were at first, pure spirits," that is, he has no doctrine of the pre-existence of the soul (J. Danielou, *Origen*, trans. by W. Mitchell, New York, 1955, p. 289). Unlike the Alexandrian, he held firmly the doctrine of the bodily resurrection. *"La liquidation l'Origénisme va être achevée sur ce point par Grégoire de Nyssa,"* explains the Cardinal (*"La Resurreciton des corps selon Grégoire de Nysse," Vigilae Christianae* III [1953], 155).

Neither did he propound a theory of cosmogono-cosmological cycles "perpetually passing through the same stages, a world never settling in one state permanently" (St Barsanuphios, *Doctrina* PG 86 900AB). Gregory's view of history, inspired by St Paul (Eph. 1:10), upheld freedom of choice. He taught "the transformation of all things and the whole, including humanity, a change from the corruptible to the eternal" (*De hom. opf.*, 22 PG 44 205C). Even if we suspect his eschatology, it cannot be denied that he expounded it in ecclesio- christological terms: the headship of Christ through His Body, the Church, becoming the cosmos in the Age to Come (Eph. 1:22-23). The creation will be transformed into another state --- καὶ πάλιν εἰς ἄλλην τινα μεταστοιχειοῦσθαι καταστάσιν παρὰ τῆς Γραφῆς διαδαχθέντες, οὐκ ἀμφιβάλλομεν (*ibid.*, 24 213C). This is hardly Origenism or Platonism (see G. Barrois, "The Alleged Origenism of St Gregory of Nyssa," *St Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* XXX, 1 [1986], 7-16).

77. καὶ ἔχει ἡ ἐκκλησία τὰς περὶ τούτων ἀποδείξεις μάλλον δὲ ἔχει πίστιν, ἀποδείξεως βεβαιοτέραν (*In verba: faciamus in hom.* I PG 44 260).

78. *De anima et res.*, 3 PG 46 108C.

79. *Vita Macr.* PG 46 960C.

80. See the discussion in V. Lossky, *The Mystical*

Theology..., p. 33f.

81. *De Beat.* I PG 44 1200C. Augustine is uncomfortable with the Church's teaching on *deificatio*, θεώσις. He said very little about it and had difficulty verbalizing it. At first, he spoke of sharing God's Substance (See Chap. I, footnote 69). Later he had another and more thoughtful opinion. God, he wrote, is God by nature, but "the rest are made gods by His grace, not of His Substance, that they should not be the same as He; but that by favour they should come to Him and be joint-heirs with Christ" --- *Caeteri qui fiunt dii, gratia ipsius fiunt, non de substantia eius nascuntur ut hoc sint quod ille, sed ut beneficium perveniant ad eum, et sint cohaeredes Christi* (*Enn. Psal.* XLIX, 2 PL 36 565). The "justified" are *ex gratia sua deificatos, non de substantia sua natos.*

Some historians believe that Augustine's "deification" was simply a metaphor of "adoption" or "justification" (e.g., *Serm. CLX*; *De Trin.* XIV, 27; *De Pecc. mer. et Rem.* II, viii, 10; *Enn. Psal.* XLI, 1), an opinion with which Professor Gerald Bonner disagrees. Augustine's *Participatio Dei fit beata*, he insists, meant precisely what the Greek Fathers indicated by deification. He admits that the Augustinian idea of deification has "a philosophical strand" (Platonic), but "Augustine develops this theologically by an appeal to the Scriptures in order to argue that man's sanctity depends upon his participation in God" ("Augustine's Conception of Deification," *The Journal of Theological Studies* XXXVII, 2 [1986], 379).

Bonner becomes a little vague about Augustine's commitment to deification during the last decade of his life. He also fails to deal with the Bishop's notion that "the human soul and rational mind --- which is in man, but not in animals --- is vivified, beatified and illumined by the very substance of God" --- *animam humanam et mentem rationalem, quae inest homini, non inest pecori, non vegetari, non beatificare, non illuminari nisi ab ipsa substantia Dei* (*In Johan. Evang.* XXIII, 5 PL 35 1584). These remarks were made about the year 414.

Bonner may be correct that Augustine's final position is "deification by grace," but how does this orthodoxy interface with Augustine's other

opinions, such as his christological dualism or crypto-nestorianism, his idea of created grace. For instance, his belief in the resurrection of the body signifies the soul's beatitude through "participation in the divine Nature." Thus, in his commentary on John's Gospel, Augustine writes that the soul participates in the incommunicable Light of God, but not the body --- *animae quippe fiunt participes illius incommunicabilis lucis, non corpora* (15 PL 35 1592). Apparently, the body shares in the divine Glory indirectly, though the soul to which it is somewhow joined.

Also, Professor Bonner misleads us, saying, that deification for Augustine is "an ecclesial process, that is, it takes place within the communion of the Church, to which the Christian is admitted by Baptism. For this reason, it (deification) can be called a sacramental process..." (*ibid.*, 383). I say "misleading," because Augustine's ecclesiology and sacramentology (mystagogy) do not adapt to the "process" about which Professor Bonner speaks here.

The doctrine of the Church in the teachings of Augustine, as we will see, is "nestorian," the same Nestorianism which outlaws any hope of deification inasmuch as this christology does not permit the "assumption" of the complete human by the Divine. In addition, Augustine asserts that Baptism may occur outside the Catholic Church; if so, then, deification (and all it entails) transpires outside of her, i.e., outside the Body of Christ --- outside of Christ.

In the words of Wilson-Kastner, Augustine differed with the Fathers "over how God and humans are related to each other in the process of deification" ("Grace as Participation in the Divine Life in the Theology of Augustine of Hippo," *Augustinian Studies* VII (1976), 151). But why call deification a "process" at all, if the elect do not change internally, if they do not shed the guilt and force of "original sin," if concupiscence is ineradicable? Following Augustinianism to its logical conclusion, we must believe that only when the predestinary decree of God is fulfilled in the Age to Come will human nature be changed. In any case, the very possibility of deification is unthinkable without the theological distinction between the divine Essence and Energies.

82. *Ora. Cat.*, 6 PG 45 25C. Chalcedonian christology is implicit in Gregory's cosmological monodualism.

83. *Contra Eu.* VII PG 45 760-761.

84. *De Vita Moysis* PG 44 377B. St Gregory made the same statement in his polemic against Eunomios (III PG 45 604BD; XII, 944C). God is unknowable now and in the Age to Come. Unlike Augustine, he denies the apprehension of God "face to face." The saved will look upon the glorified Man Who is God, not the Essence of the Divine (See V. Lossky, *The Vision of God*, trans. by A. Moorhouse, Clayton [Wisc.], 1963, pp. 88-91).

85. *De anima et res.*, 3 PG 46 96C.

86. Human reason cannot reach beyond sense-experience and concepts (*loc. cit.*). It has the faculty to draw conclusions, make inferences and deductions, a power which explains its role, among other things, as guardian of the heart (See the Introduction to volume 3 of *The Philokalia*, p. 361).

87. St Gregory often used the expression "archetypal Beauty," but has no doctrine of exemplarism. The words referred to Christ who, as the Fathers sometimes called Him, is "the Form of all things." The implication is "chalcedonian," not Platonic. The cosmos, the Church, man are "icons" of Him. So it is with the "image of God" (εἰκών τοῦ θεοῦ) in man. If he is the "image of God," it is because, as St Gregory asserts in *On the Creation of Man*, he is the sovereign of creation who freely works his will through reason --- not because he is "the analogy of the divine Being" (*De Hom. opf.* XVI PG 44 184AB). Augustine, however, recast the *imago Dei* Platonically: the soul as the analogy of the divine Being. As P.J. Riga, writes, "St Augustine developed his own theory of the divine image in man" ("Created Grace in Augustine," 125).

88. *De opif. hom.* XVI, 10 PG 44 184AB.

89. St Gregory was a synergist. "The grace of our Saviour," he exclaimed, "is given to them who struggle to receive it" --- ἡ τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν τοῖς πόθῳ δεχομένοις ἐδωρήσατο χάρις (*De Inst. christ.*, PG 46 288B).

90. *Contra Eun.* I PG 45 336CD.

91. See the valuable article by Vladimir Lossky, "The Procession of the Holy Spirit in Orthodox Triadology," *Eastern Churches Quarterly* VII, 2 (1948), 48-49.

Chapter IV

Augustine: Original Sin, Grace and Predestination

The ideas of "original sin," "grace" and "predestination" were organically linked in the mind of Augustine. We cannot understand the one without the other. As Augustine conceived them, these doctrines were in fact not part of the Apostolic Tradition. He claimed Scriptural authority for these doctrines, especially that of St Paul; but, on account of his philosophical prejudices, he could not rightly expound the Church's sacred oracles. To quote G. Nygren, "the Augustinian transposition of early Christian thought comes finally to this, that the words of the Bible are refracted by the medium of Augustine's philosophy of religion."[1]

In particular, Nygren refers to "Augustine's metaphysical speculations peculiarly interwoven with his epistemological investigations."[2] He also mentions Augustine's "exemplarism" and "seminal reasons" in connection with his theory of predestination which more than one historian considers to be the "very essence of Augustinianism."[3] No doubt predestination as God's hidden Will, as the cause of salvation and damnation, is deeply anchored in his thought, at least from the

time of the Pelagian controversy; and it was surely Augustine's preoccupation during the last years of his life.

Also, predestination is inseparable from Augustine's doctrine of irresistible grace. Grace for him is a divine but created force, whereby God compels the will of man from evil to good and negates the consequences of "original sin" in those who are baptized. The grace of the Sacrament of Baptism is given to "many" while on the "few" is imposed irresistibly "the grace of perseverance" which denies apostasy to the elect. Saving grace is compulsory, because, if freely given, the wicked nature of man would reject it. The Reformation will adopt Augustine charitology as its own.

In the pages that follow, a full picture of Augustine's soteriology will emerge; and we will also discover the sources of his extraordinary teachings. First, we must look at Origen, then, the Manicheans, Ambrosiaster, all of which, as we shall see, coalesced with Augustine's Platonism to produce, among other things, the idea of salvation commonly associated with the African's name. On the subjects of "original sin," "grace" and "predestination," Augustine will speak for himself. With the previous testimony of the Fathers in hand, Augustine's disparity with their consensus will be clear.

1. Origen and Augustine

It is astonishing that the Greek Pope Anastasios (399-401), in a letter to Bishop Simplicanus of Milan, successor to St Ambrose, strongly censured Origen and his acolyte, Rufinus of Aquileia, although he had never

read anything written by Origen while also confessing to be unfamiliar with the name until informed of it by Patriarch Theophilos of Alexandria. Astonishing, I say, since Origen was a theologian of no little repute, aside from the fact that he had visited Rome during the pontificate of Zephyrinos (198-217), at which time, incidentally, he attended a lecture by Plotinos. Later, Origen wrote to Pope Fabianus (d. 250) in order to vindicate his teachings, albeit without much success.

Moreover, Origenism was a fact of Christian Roman life and thought, especially with the translations of Origen's writings into Latin by St Jerome and Rufinus. Augustine had made use of Origenist literature before he came to Rome. While yet a layman in Tagaste, he wrote several commentaries on divine creation (389) against the Manicheans, commentaries which utilized Origen's exegesis of the first chapter of the book of Genesis. Like the Alexandrian, he allegorized the chapter, a chapter which, as he said, if understood literally would justify the Manichean objections to creationism.[4]

In 401, Augustine's cosmogonic *magnum opus*, *De Genesi ad litteram*, full of Neo-Platonic ideas on the soul and creation --- along with the concluding books of the *Confessions* --- offer ample testimony of Augustine's indebtedness to Platonism, perhaps mediated by the thought of Origen. These books sometimes remind us of the man from Alexandria, e.g., Augustine says that "the heavens and the earth" are intellectual and physical entities.[5] Like Origen, too, he erects a great chain of being from the most celestial to the most terrestrial creature.[6]

Although in agreement about the dual structure of

the cosmos --- thanks to their Platonism --- Origen and Augustine do not agree on the nature of man's Fall. According to Origen, the diversity of the world order is the consequence of a great cosmic disaster --- the ontological movement from primordial oneness to tragic multiplicity, a multiplicity which eventually returns all things to their original unity (ἀποκαταστάσις τῶν πάντων). In Augustine, a similar theme appears, for example in book 389 of *On the Morals of the Manicheans*. God, he said, orders every being to a station according to his deeds and disposition; yet Augustine had no doctrine of universal restoration, pre-existence of the soul and, unlike Origen, Augustine upholds a belief in Hell.[7]

The Bishop of Hippo disagreed with Origen on this matter because, among other things, the former taught a doctrine of "predestination" and "irresistible grace." Augustine was, however, not insensitive to Origen's theory of the "tainted soul." In fact, he may have inspired Augustine's idea of "original sin," something which many historians prefer to attribute to the unabated effects of Manicheism on him. Yet, Origen clearly propounded a theory of the "tainted soul", the "soul of Adam" with whom his posterity had "seminal identity", an "identity" which accounted for the existence of the "taint" in the souls of all men. Augustine, as we know, explained the presence of the "taint" in each person as the result of the transmission of Adam's guilt through the parental seed.[8]

Thus, if Augustine is indebted to Origen for the idea of "seminal identity" (and it is not inconceivable), he did not borrow it without modification, a modification with logical consquences

of its own. It raised, above all, the question of the manner of the transmission of Adam's guilt. According to Augustine, Adam's identification with his progeny lay in the sharing of his guilt, a guilt transmitted, he said, through the the act of sexual reproduction: the mother gives the body and the father the soul, the soul wherein the new human being inherits Adam's guilt. Traducianism, as the theory is called, was Augustine's way of protecting God against any responsibility for evil, since if He created the soul of every infant, then, He stands accused of abetting the transmission of evil from parents to offspring.

In truth, Augustine was unhappy with Traducianism, because it implied a material conception of the soul, a conception wholly uncongenial to his Platonism which, as we know, presents the soul as completely spiritual. Yet, he believed that if Traducianism were rejected, it would be impossible to explain the necessity for infant-Baptism; that is, if God injected the created soul directly into the body, then, the guilt of Adam's sin could not pass from parent(s) to child.[9] Man, then, would not be totally depraved and grace would be subordinate to his will. The idea of predestination, as Augustine defined it, becomes illogical.

But, there is more to his thinking on predestination than soteriology. Unlike Origen, he equated God's Knowledge and Will which necessarily implied that His Foreknowledge was predeterminate. The Bishop of Hippo concluded that to reject this equation must lead to Origen's idea that all knowledge is finite, a limitation which God would voluntarily endure in order to save souls. Clearly, if man could choose his end, then, the knowledge of God would need to accommodate the vicissitude of human choices; but, said

Augustine, everyone believes that God knows and controls all things and "His comprehension is incomprehensible."

Such an apophatic expression may well have been a throwback to his early career when he took positions very much like those of the Fathers. During the Manichean controversy, however, he made some serious alterations in his theology. He began to teach, among other things, that whatever happened in time happened with an unalterable purpose. One thing proceeds from another as a necessary conclusion from its premise. In retrospect, one can see that the past is what it is by necessity, with no options; likewise, the present rises from it and the future from the circumstances of the present. One wonders that Augustine argued for free will at all.[10]

Important, then, is H. Chadwick's comparison of Origen and Augustine. They differ, he said, not in their taste for Platonism, but in that Origen, apparently unembarrassed by his attraction to Hellenism, incorporated less into his theology than Augustine. Their fundamental point of divergence lies precisely in their notions of free will which for Augustine "is virtually an unreal concept unless grace restores to it the delight in righteousness which comes with the infusion of the Holy Spirit into the hearts of believers."[11]

In any case, whatever we may think of Origen's connection with Augustine, we cannot doubt his relevance to the development of the latter's ideas, ideas circulating in the West and in Rome when he was there. It is also fair to say that Augustinianism was indirectly part of the general critique of Origenism which may be assessed from three points of view: 1) as

a danger of "the tradition of men" to God's revelation; 2) of the need to avoid taking up opposite but equally false positions in order to refute Origenism; and finally 3) of the need to staunchly reaffirm the Apostolic Tradition only in terms intrinsic to it.[12]

2. Original Sin

We cannot be certain to what extent Augustine was indebted to his Manichean past. The Pelagians accused him of "Manichean fatalism" (i.e., predestination) and "pessimism" concerning human nature. Professor Hans Eibel describes the young Augustine as not unlike so many of his generation, looking to Manicheism for peace of mind. It failed them, primarily because its dualism, the incessant clash between flesh and spirit, only intensified their pain and confusion. Then Augustine, as others, turned to the Academicians for "answers," but could not find them there. Finally, he discovered Plotinos --- *"Da fand er durch Victorinus den Weg zum NeuPlatonismus."*[13]

One may wonder at the relative ease with which he passed from Manicheism, Academic skepticism to Neo-Platonism; and, indeed, that he could incorporate elements of Origenism into his philosophy and theology. Both the Platonists and the Manicheans taught Augustine to give "unqualified assent" to the value of the invisible world and the truth it surrendered, as one historian observed.[14] But the same may be said of Origenism and the Academics, albeit the latter through its disparagement of logic and the senses.

Each source, each stage through which Augustine passed reinforced the others. For example, the Manicheans distinguished between their own members

("the sons of mystery," "the enlightened") and the "worldly" ("the sons of darkness," "the uninitiated"); and also among themselves, between the "elect" (*perfecti*) and "learners" (*auditores*). These distinctions resembled the Christian classification of "the Faithful" and "the catechumens," that is, between "the baptized" or "enlightened" inculcated with the *disciplina arcani*, eligible for the Mysteries or Sacraments; and those preparing for admission to the Church, "the unbaptized" or "the unenlightened" believers.

Christianity called for the separation of the Church from the "world," "the race of Christ" from "race of Adam" (cf. II Cor. 6: 14-18); and as a Christian, Augustine understood the antithesis between the Church and the world, between those "in Christ" and those waiting to become Christians through the mystagogical rite of initiation; and he used this knowledge to the advantage of his peculiar ecclesiology and soteriology. In a word, he was the first Orthodox writer to divide the Church between those of her children in possession of common or "sufficient grace" and those blessed with "efficacious grace," the grace which works infallibly in the will of the "elect" to save them.[15]

All Christians have "sufficient grace," Augustine said, the grace by which our freedom is restored, the grace to "cooperate" (*gratia cooperans*) with God; the grace to choose between good and evil; but, yet, only certain individuals among the members of the Church will be saved according to the eternal and hidden decree of God. Thus, "sufficient grace," "the grace of cooperation," or even "prevenient grace" is not the grace by which we are elected. The "grace of

perseverance" --- the "irresistible" and "efficacious grace" --- is the grace of salvation. Very simply, members of the Church --- the saved and the damned --- are called and abandoned by God "according to His Purpose." "Many" are called, but only a "few" are chosen.[16]

The Church, contrary to Augustine, has always proclaimed herself the refuge of "all" ("the many"), not merely an elect "few." Christ is the universal Saviour: He represented the entire human race on the Cross and died for the sins of all, rising from the dead for all. God "wills that all men be saved and come to the knowledge of the truth" for which reason saving grace is offered to all, a grace which excludes no person from the promises of the Messiah, the God-Man.

Such, however, was not the mind of Augustine. Like Plato and Plotinos, Mani and the Academics, he proposed an "elitism": salvation for the "few." The "few" are saved unconditionally by the grace of God, which He has irresistably imposed on them. The "few" are "the sons of God" who gradually distance themselves from material things, things to which Adam's sin has subjected them. By grace, the saved escape the bondage of the flesh.

Although Augustine did not equate sin or moral evil with matter, he always had a certain disdain for the physical, not the least of which was sex.[17] He seems to have first publicly mentioned the idea that guilt of "original sin" comes through the sexual act during his debate with Pelagius.[18] For Augustine, sex was evil, but tolerable within the married state, that is, marriage was instituted by God for purpose of restraining the concupiscence --- *contra*

concupiscentiae pugnet.[19] "Faithful spouses use this evil well," he once commented, "yet the offspring generated from this evil contract guilt" --- *Hoc einm male bene utuntur fideles conjugati, et ex hoc qui generantur reatum trahunt.*[20]

Later modifying these remarks, he said, "not that children coming from an evil action are evil, since, I do not argue that the purpose of begetting of children is evil. As a matter of fact, I assert that it is good, because marriage makes good use of evil lust, and through this good use, human beings, a good work of God, are produced." So that it would not appear that he contradicted himself, Augustine added that the sexual act "is not performed without evil," inasmuch as it is the means by which an evil, Adam's guilt, is transmitted to those born of sexual generation and for which reason, incidentally, children are regenerated in Baptism --- *quia bene utitur libidinis malo, per quod generantur homines bonum opus Dei; non sine malo propter quod regenerandi sunt, ut laberantur a malo.*[21]

Augustine represented his doctrine to Julian, Bishop of Eclanum as the Faith of the Catholic Church, a doctrine "which the Fathers most evidently defended against you before you were born; so we assert that, no matter when he was born, the infant, innocent of personal sin, is guilty of the original sin."[22] His opponent rightly denied Augustine's theory, asserting that he had derived it from an extra-Christian source: Manicheism. One might also argue that Manicheism, although the principal source, was not alone in producing in Augustine a contempt for matter and sex. Origenists and Neo-Platonists were also ashamed to wear a body.

Unfortunately, Julian, if we may trust the extant

writings, seems not to have assessed the other moral and metaphysical sources of Augustinianism. His quotes from the Fathers were ineffectual, mainly because he made them spokesmen for Pelagian monergism and autosoterism. Augustine countered with patristic phrases and paragraphs of his own and made them speak for him. The Fathers, Greek and Latin, became advocates of "original sin" as well as "irresistable grace" and "predestination" in his hands as they were champions of absolute human autonomy and moral perfectibility in the hands of the Pelagians.

3. Predestination

In his two volume *The Theology of St Paul*,[23] Ferdnan Prat tells us that Augustine's exegesis of Romans --- especially its 8th and 9th chapters --- "underwent in the course of time two radical changes."[24] From 385 to 394, he interpreted St Paul like the Fathers, although he had already begun to question the place of the human will in the act of conversion. He distinguished two categories of the "called" in conformity with the Gospel parables. But in 397, he reproached himself for having allowed so much to escape his notice. Augustine now formulated "a new theory which can be regarded as his definitive and final thought, since he finds nothing to eliminate in his *Retractiones* and will return to it unreservedly in *De praedestione sanctorum IV* and *De dono perseverantiae XX*."[25]

Augustine then taught that election is absolutely gratuitous, indifferent to foreseen merits, preceding any good action and wholly subordinated to God's arbitrary Will.[26] With no respect to context, he

extracted passages from Romans and other epistles in order to prove his contention --- proclaiming that the holy Scriptures taught such doctrines. In fact, he had abandoned the traditional view and, during the Pelagian controversy, had come to utterly confound divine prescience and predestination.[27]

a. Why the change in Augustine? There are several reasons, but none more important than the influence of Ambrosiaster[28] whose writings he encountered in Rome. It was he who brought to Augustine's attention what would become the Africans favorite soteriological verse: Romans 5:12 --- *Propeterea sicut per unum hominem in hunc mundum peccatum intravit, et per peccatum mors, et ita in omnes pertansit, in quo omnes peccaverunt* --- words he would repeat over and over again in his writings. For reasons of his own, Augustine did not question Ambrosiaster's exegetical method and did not bother to check the Latin translation against the Greek original.[29]

Romans 5:12 in no way supports Augustine's theory that each person is guilty of Adam's "original sin" --- and he committed several while in Eden; but rather it declares *mors* to be the cause of the human condition. Neither did Augustine give heed to Nature as a victim of Adam's disobedience (Rom. 8:19-23). He simply ignored the cosmological ramifications of the Fall in favor of its less important moral and legal dimensions, with Ambrosiaster supplying the Scriptural method.

b. The root of Augustine's pessimism is best sought in his Manicheism. He came to the study of Ambrosiaster with it. He came looking to give his incomplete anthropology greater consistency and cogency. He should have turned instead to the Fathers,

to St John Chrysostom (whom he greatly admired) for the right understanding of the Epistle to the Romans.[30] He would have heard John say that Adam's transgression condemned himself and his posterity to mortality --- Ἐκείνου πέσοντος, καὶ μὴ φάγοντες ἀπὸ τοῦ ξύλου γεγονάσιν ἐξ ἐκείνου πάντες θνητοί.[31] Similarly, in the tradition of the Latin Fathers, St Peter Chrysologus explains the meaning of Romans 5:12 as "the fault of our first parents has sentenced us to death" --- *quos morti culpa primi parentis addixerat* --- while the grace of Christ restores us to life.[32]

Augustine, although not indifferent to the role of death and the devil in Adam's Fall, pushed "guilt" and "grace" center-stage. Perhaps, Pelagius and his emphasis on human innocence and energy drove Augustine to the opposite side of the issue; and maybe, he came to the wars with pessimism as part of his intellectual storehouse; but whatever the truth, he lost sight of the traditional teaching that, as Fr Romanides puts it, "Man does not die because he is guilty of the sin of Adam. He becomes a sinner because he is yoked to the power of the devil through death and its consequences."[33]

But, preoccupied with his own agenda, Augustine disregarded the Fathers and appealed to the Apostle for support (Romans 8:28-32):

> And we know that all things work together (συνεργεῖ) for good to them that love God, to them that are called according to His purpose. For whom He did foreknow, He also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of His Son, that He might be the firstborn among many brethren. Moreover, whom He did predestinate, them He also called; and whom He called, He also justified; and whom He justified, them He also glorified.

Augustine interpreted the passage for Julian of Eclanum.

> The Apostle says, 'All things work together (*cooperatur*) for good, for those who have have been called according to His purpose (*secundum propositum vocati sunt*),' to which he adds, 'for those Whom He foreknew, has He also predestinated to become conformed to the image of His Son, that He should be the firstborn among many brethren. And those whom He called, He also justified; and those whom He justified, them He also glorified.' These have been called according to His purpose; therefore, they have been chosen, even before the foundation of the world (Eph. 1:4) by Him 'Who calls things that are not as though they were' (Rom. 4:17); but they have been chosen through the election of grace (*Sed electi per electionem gratiae*). Thus, the same teacher [Paul] says about old Israel, 'There is a remnant left, selected by grace.' And lest one thinks that they were chosen before the foundation of the world on account of foreknown good works, the Apostle adds, 'And if by grace, then, not of works; otherwise grace is no more grace' (Rom. 11:5-6).
>
> Concerning the elect and the predestined, even those who have led the worst kind of life, they are led to repentance through God's

goodness by whose patience they were not removed from this life in the commission of offenses; thus, allowing them and their co-heirs to see the depth of evil from which man has been delivered. Not one of them perishes, whatever his age at death. Let it not be said that the predestined are permitted to die without the Sacrament of the Mediator. For the sake of these persons, our Lord said, 'This is the Will of the Father Who sent me, that I should lose none of them He gave me' (Jn. 6:39).

Mortals, not of this number, but belonging to another mass, have been made vessels of wrath as born to the advantage of the saved. God creates nothing rashly or fortuitously, knowing what good may be made of them, since He works good by the very gift of humanity in them, and for their sake He adorns the order of the present world. Yet, He leads none of them to the salubrious and spiritual repentance by which a man in Christ is reconciled to God.

Therefore, all men by nature share in the mass of perdition (*ex eadam massa perditionis*), unrepentant according to the hardness of their hearts, whereby they store up wrath for themselves in the Day of Wrath, when each will be compensated according to his works, there are some who by the Mercy of God are led to repent while others He simply abandons (*Deus tamen alios inde per misercordem bonitatem adducit ad poenitentiam alios secundum justum judicium no adducit*).[34]

With most of what Augustine has written here an Orthodox must disagree. First the word *cooperatur*, συνεργεῖ is an intransitive verb, correctly rendered "all things work together," not God makes "all things work together" which is the interpretation Augustine adopts. Also, *secundum propositum sunt*, κατὰ πρόθεσιν κλητοῖς οὖσιν, refers to the divine Plan without excluding free human purpose.

Contrast Augustine's opinion with St John Chrysostom's testimony. He stated that the heavenly call is not sufficient for salvation, not without the "purpose" of the "called" --- ὅτι οὐχ ἡ κλῆσις μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἡ πρόθεσις τῶν καλουμένων τὴν σωτηρίαν εἰργάσατο.[35] "The elect are chosen according to purpose," Cyril writes, "the purpose of Him Who called them and of their own."[36] In other words, the human will is necessarily part of the Divine Plan of salvation. We look in vain among his writings for the idea of compulsion as a component of the Divine Economy.

Predestination always presupposes prescience in the thinking of the Fathers. God predestines to grace and to faith all those, and only those, who respond to divine grace.[37] They agree with St John Chrysostom that "all men are called, but not all obeyed" --- πάντες γοῦν ἐκλήθησαν, ἀλλ' οὐ πάντες ὑπήκουσαν.[38] Every Father of the Church is a synergist.[39]

c. Did Augustine know that his Romans exegesis was singular?[40] He did indeed; and he knew that he had forsaken in later life what he had formerly espoused. For example, the young Augustine was aware that in Romans 9:13-15:

As it is written, Jacob have I loved, but Esau

> have I hated. What then shall we say? Is there unrighteousness with God? God forbid! For He said to Moses, I will have mercy on whom I will have mercy, and I will have compassion on whom I will have compassion.

St Paul referred to two peoples presaged through the twins, Esau and Jacob --- *quod du populi geminis, Esau scilicet et Jacob praemonstrantur*[41] --- and not types of the elect and the damned. But later in his *De diversis quaestionibus ad Simpliciam* (397), he came to think in those fatalistic terms which became so characteristic of his Pelagian period.[42] Jacob became the type of those who are saved, those who have been "called," "justified" and "glorified," those predestined from all eternity by the hidden counsel of God; and Esau was the type of the reprobate.

The change in his Scriptural method was not sudden. He began gradually to diverge from the tradition of the Fathers.[43] For example, in 389 he taught that God surrendered Pharaoh to an "unsound mind," because he had "hardened his heart" against the word of Moses. Later Augustine argued that God would do nothing to convert (if, in fact, He did not lead him to it) the "obdurate heart of Pharaoh" --- *ut obduratio Dei sit nolle misereri.*[44]

Augustine pushed relentlessly through the Scriptures in order to recruit support for his new theories. With special regard to predestination, Reuter notes that Augustine did not adopt it after patient and careful study, but in "the fury of the dialectical hunt."[45] Eventually, his peculiar theology and soteriology became in his mind the Catholic Tradition. He had come to think that everything he

professed could be shown to rest upon the Scriptures and the Fathers. He was certain that whatever differences might exist between him and other Christian writers was the result of circumstance. His task, as he saw it, was to use the tools of his Graeco-Roman culture to bring out all the rational implications of the Christian Faith.

4. Grace and Free Will

The so-called "Pelagian controversy" --- which might just as well have been called "the Augustinian controversy" --- seems to have been ignited by a petty incident. Augustine related that, while in Rome, his words --- "Give what Thou commandest and command what Thou willst" (*De quod jubes et jube quod*) --- were repeated by some bishop in the presence of Pelagius who could not bear them "and contradicting somewhat too excitedly, nearly came to a quarrel with the man who had spoken them."[46] These, and like words implied for Pelagius a pessimism about human nature which, as Augustine reported, led the British monk to impeach all Catholics as Manicheans.[47]

Pelagius and his followers maintained that human nature is essentially good, a nature impaired by no ancient malignancy. For this reason, St Jerome numbered him among the disciples of Origen; in fact, he looked upon Pelagianism as one more episode in the history of Origenism. Pelagius was indeed an advocate of Origen's "perfectionism," that is, human nature can, in this life, achieve *vita beata*, a position which Pelagius defended in his *De natura* and in his famous letter to the virgin, Demetriada. He is reported to have said to her that anyone can live without sin ---

Ego dico posse esse hominem sine peccato.[48]

Pelagius had thus set the tone of the debate. The cosmic nature of the Fall, the significance of death and sin, were nearly obfuscated in the altercation over the question of human perfectibility. He objected to Augustine's standard, "What hast thou which thou hast not received" (I Cor. 4:7), arguing that if he were right, then, all human action is emptied of moral purpose. There would be no reason for God to have given His creatures commandments to obey. The Bishop of Hippo replied that men are sinners and they can achieve nothing worthy of salvation without grace. Pelagius maintained that Augustine's notion would necessarily include infants who, as everyone knows, are innocent, emerging from their mothers wombs as undefiled as the pristine Adam.

If infants are not sinners, Augustine asked, why then are they baptized? Pelagius responded that the eradication of some inherent moral defect is not the intent of Baptism, but rather "spiritual illumination, adoption to divine sonship, citizenship in the heavenly Jerusalem, admission to the fellowship of Christ and possession of the Kingdom of God" --- *illuminatio spiritualis, adoptio filiorum Dei, municipatus Jerusalem caelistis, sanctificatio atque in Christi membra translatio, et possessio regni caelorum.*[49] Had he been a true Christian, Pelagius would have added --- liberation from the devil, washing away of actual sins (for adults) and the beginning of the process of deification.

On the matter of infant-Baptism, the battle was fiercely joined. Augustine vigorously attacked Pelagius's autosoterism which he described as neither Christian nor logical. At the same time, he chided

Pelagius with the boast that his doctrine of "original sin" *ex antiqua et indubitata fidei regula.*[50] Early in the debate he quoted the Fathers as well as Scriptures to buttress his opinions, but in the last decade of the controversy (and his life), Augustine's appeal to their authority faded dramatically. He clung tenaciously to several of his favorite Biblical verses.

One may believe that differences between Augustine and Pelagius could have been resolved with the right understanding of Adam's Fall; and the Bishop was justified in rejecting the Pelagian perfectionism. He was also correct to reject Pelagius' idea that the transgression of Adam affected no one but himself. Finally, Augustine was not alone in believing that Adam was created "able to sin" and "able to die" for which reason he was "able to be tempted." Such also was the condition of Christ.

On the other hand, the Lord did not succumb to the sophistry of the devil and committed no sin, but rather Christ was "obedient even to the death of the Cross" (Phil.2:8). Our suspicions about Augustine are aroused when he began to define the nature of the Fall.

> Banished from Paradise after his sin, Adam bound his offspring also with the penalty of damnation, an offspring bound with the sin by which he had corrupted himself...so that his progeny, born through fleshly concupiscence, received the fitting retribution for his disobedience. From himself and his spouse (herself the occasion of his sin and his companion in damnation), the human race was burdened with the original sin throughout the ages, burdened with the manifold errors and

> sorrows down to the final and endless torment with the rebel angels... Thus the matter stood; the damned lump of humanity (*totius humani generis massa damnata*) was lying prostrate; nay, wallowing in evil, falling headlong from one wickedness to another; and joined to that faction of angels which had sinned, both paying the most deserved penalty for their impious treason.[51]

Once more quoting Romans 5:12, Augustine explained the "original sin" as the first sin of Adam, the sin whose guilt is the legacy of every individual born of his substance; or, more precisely, "in him was constituted the form of condemnation to his future progeny, who should spring from him by natural descent," that is, "all from one are born to condemnation and unable to achieve salvation without grace" --- *quia in illo constitua est forma condemnationis futuris posteris, qui eius propagine createntur, ut ex uno omnes in condemnationem nascerentur, ex quia non liberat nisi gratia salvatoris.*[52]

With the exception of the Lord --- for He, although born of Adam, was not born "by natural descent" --- everyone born of woman inherits the guilt of our first parents. It is transmitted by the act of procreation which necessarily involves sexual lust, "the concupiscence...as the law of sin which remains in the members of this body of death" --- *Concupiscentia igitur tanquam lex peccati manens in membris corporis mortis huius, cum parvulus nascitur.*[53] And Augustine adds that "in some sense, the human race was also delivered to the power of the devil by the Justice of

God, with the sin of the first man passing from the start into both sexes who were born of conjugal union, binding the debt of our first parents to all their offspring --- *Quadam justitia Dei in potestatem diaboli traditum est genus humanum, peccato primi humanis in omnes utriusque sexus commixtione nascentes originaliter transuetes, et parentum primorium debito universos posteros obligante.*[54]

Not even Augustine's concession to the Catholic Tradition was accurate: man was not "delivered" into the hands of the devil by "the Justice of God," but he became a slave to the evil One through the power of death. Augustine's error was the result of his preoccupation with the moral consequences of the Fall. The cosmological *angst*, the struggle between good and evil, fades before the terror of the divine Wrath and the folly of human turpitude. Thus, Augustine remarked,

> 'Wherefore, as by one man sin entered into the world, and by sin death; so death passed upon all men, for all have sinned' (Rom. 5:12). Here the Apostle disputes at some length concerning the two men: the first Adam, through whose sin and death we, his posterity, are the obligatory recipients of hereditary evils, so to speak; and the second Adam, Who is both man and God, Who, when He had paid our debts which He did not owe, freed us from the debts of our parents as well as our own. Therefore, the devil, through the transgression of one [Adam] holds all captive who are born and corrupted by carnal concupiscence, while the elect are freed and regenerated by one [Christ] through His

immaculate spiritual grace.[55]

Significant in this passage is the diminished role of the devil. He is not really needed where man is both "the obligatory recipient of hereditary evils" and wholly powerless before the suffusion of saving grace. And, of course, man dies because he sins or, in other terms, man is "unable not to sin" and "unable not to die."[56]

In Augustine's scheme of things, what need of the devil? And in that scheme of things, what of infants? They do not sin! Why do they die? What power has the devil over them? Augustine answers:

> Therefore, the guilt (*reatus*) of the corruption about which we are speaking will remain in the carnal offspring of the regenerate until the former are cleansed by the laver of regeneration. Even a regenerate man has not the power to regenerate himself, but only to generate sons according to the flesh; and thus he leaves his children not the condition of the regenerate, but of the carnally born. Hence, whether a person is believer or unbeliever, he does not beget faithful children, but sinners; in the same way as the seed of a wild and uncultivated olive tree produces only wild olives. So it is that his first birth holds a man in the bondage from which only a second birth can deliver him. The devil holds him, Christ liberates him: Eve's deceiver binds us, Mary's Son looses us... The former was able to hold men in his grasp though one; and none delivers him from his power save One, the One Whom the devil cannot grasp. Thus the very

> Sacraments of the Church, which she administers with due ceremony and according to the authority of ancient tradition...the very Sacraments, I say, of the holy Church show very plainly enough that infants, even when fresh from the womb, are delivered from bondage to the devil only through the grace of Christ.[57]

Without Baptism *in Christo*, there is no salvation and no virtue. Yet, man has free choice:

> We do not say that by the sin of Adam free will simply perished from human nature; but for those subject to the devil, it avails for nothing but sin; it does not produce good and pious living until the will of man is made free by God's grace, the grace which assists the regenerate in every good movement of action, of speech, of thought... Nor are we promoting the idea of fate under the name of God's grace... If, however, it is agreeable for some to call the Will of the Almighty by the name of fate, while we indeed 'shun profane novelties of words' (I Tim. 6:20), we will not quibble.[58]

Augustine persistently argued that his ideas of original sin, grace and predestination did not abrogate free will. But what kind of volition is it that has no power to choose between good and evil; or choose the good without first being overwhelmed by grace? Even in Christ a person is not entirely free from Adam's curse. He may be freed from "original sin" (*actus*), Augustine said, but not its consequence, the guilt (*reatus*): the tyrannical burden which children inherit from their parents despite the grace of Baptism.[59]

How can man be said to exercize free will when he has no role to play in God's decision to save or damn him?

> Once again, let no one glory in his own work or his free will, as if some merit originated from himself, or as if the freedom to do good works had been bestowed on him as a reward; rather let him hear the voice of grace, 'For it is God Who works in us both to do and to will according to His good pleasure' (Phil. 2:13). And in another place, "It is not therefore a matter of man's willing, of his running, but of God's mercy' (Rom. 9:16). Not of 'man's willing' or 'running,' but 'God's mercy' means precisely that the entire process is credited to God Who prepares the will and helps the will thus prepared.[60]

God decides to whom He will give grace and no mortal may presume to judge Him. We may not question His Justice, the Justice by which in truth none ought to be saved. Neither should we be disconcerted that, although He gives grace to all the baptized, He determines who among them will never fall away.

> For whosoever is elected is without doubt also called; but not everyone is necessarily elected. He is elected, as has often been said, who is called according to His 'purpose'. He is predestined and foreknown. If any of the elect should perish, God is mistaken; but, of course, none of them do perish, because He is never mistaken. If anyone of them perish, God is surely overcome by human sin; but none of them perish, because God is invincible...[61]

It was such ideas which so scandalized St John Cassian and his monks. Augustine declared that Christians who apostacized may have been "called," but they were never "chosen." In other words, the unsaved

> are not made to differ from the condemned masses, doomed through the foreknowledge and predestination of God, and, therefore, they are not called according to His 'purpose'; thus, they were not elected, rather they belong to those about whom it was said, 'Many are called, but few are elected.'[62]

Not only are the "called" chosen forcibly, but likewise the condemned have no way to alter their fate. With regard to the former, Augustine maintains "that God not merely provides the opportunity of starting on the road to salvation," as Professor Williams explains, "but operates in man the very willingness to accept the opportunity, so that not the faintest and most elementary beginning of man's Godward aspiration rises from himself nor has any other source except the arbitrarily bestowed and irresistible grace of God."[63]

To use the words of Augustine's alter-ego, John Calvin, sinful man would have naturally rejected the grace of God offered freely; therefore, "the elect are drawn in a wonderful way, *that he may be willing*, by Him Who knows how to work inwardly on the hearts of men and so to work in them not that they may believe against their wills (which would be impossible), but that they may be made willing to believe who were before unwilling to believe."[64]

Faith is the gift of God, given to whom He wills,

given to the saved so that they will never backslide. Augustine and Calvin taught that faith is not earned; it is not deserved; and in the elect it cannot be lost. Thus, the Bishop of Hippo wrote, "God foreknew believers; but He chose them that they might be so, not because they were already so" --- *quia prescivit Deus credituros, non quia facturus fuerat ipse credentes.*[65] God chose "the few" in Christ before the foundation of the world,

> predestinating us to the adoption of sons, not because He foresaw that we ourselves would be holy and blameless; but He chose and predestined us that we might be so. Moreover, He made His choice according to His good pleasure so that none might glory concerning his own will, but in the richness of His grace and good will towards Him.[66]

In *De dono perseverantiae*, written a few years before his death, Augustine restated his theory that the elect cannot fall away, preserved not by their own strength, but only by the grace of God. "For assuredly, the gift of God is granted to them...that they may not fall into temptation," Augustine wrote. "No saint ever fails to persevere in holiness to the end."[67] In a word, "He who falls, falls by his own will, but he who stands, stands by God's Will."[68]

Thus, the Bishop of Hippo played the simpleton to the end, demanding that his system of divine predetermination and coercive grace left room for free will.[69] He wanted his listeners to assent to the paradox of human freedom and God's absolute and arbitrary sovereignty. One may suppose that he would

not part with the idea of human freedom in order to protect the goodness of God.[70] A strange defense, too, when one considers that, according to Augustine, no human being can do good without grace, a grace which the Almighty deliberately withholds from the majority of His creatures.

How, too, does Augustine's idea of double predestination exonerate God from evil? The contention that the reprobate are predestined to condemnation on account of their pride and "the original sin" while the elect are "judged and disciplined contrary to their pride if they are the children of mercy" is at best contradictory.[71] How is God good, how merciful and just, if His decision to save or reprobate is based on His secret Council wholly insensitive to human choices? If, as Augustine repeats again and again, God's decisions are beyond our judgment, then, why seek to justify Them with elaborate disquisitions on the depravity of human nature?[72]

Also, if some are predestined to glory and others to perdition, the number of each group is necessarily fixed. Thus, Abraham was elect not, in the first instance, because of his faith --- which God imposed on him --- or saving deeds --- the result of irresistible grace --- but because he was numbered from all eternity among those whom God had chosen. "It is God, therefore, who makes a man to persevere in the good, who makes him good," Augustine wrote to the monks at Hardumentum. "But they who fall and perish have never been in the number of the predestined" --- *Qui autem cadunt et pereunt, in praedestinatorum numero non fuerunt.*[73]

None would be saved if God had not "brought aid to the infirmity of the human will, so that it might be

unchanegably and invincibly motivated by divine grace" --- *Subventum est igitur infirmati voluntatis humanae, ut divna gratia indeclinabiliter et inseparabiliter ageretur.* Even though the will of the elect may be "weak" (*invalida*) and incapable of good (*imbecilla in bono*), God prevents their defection.[74] Without grace, none can be saved; but because the elect possess the mercy that will not fail, they rejoice in the Lord. Wrote Augustine:

> I speak thus of those who are predestined to the Kingdom of God, whose number is so certain that none may be added to or taken from them; not of those who, when He had announced and spoken, were multiplied beyond number. For they may be described as 'called' --- not 'chosen' --- because they were not called according to the 'purpose.' But that number of the elect is certain, a number which is neither augmented nor diminished (*Certum vero esse numerum electorum, neque augmendum neque minuendum*).[75]

As the grace of calling and election is the free gift of God, so likewise is the grace of perseverance.

> Therefore, the number of the saints, by God's grace predestined to the Kingdom of God through the unremmitable gift of perseverance bestowed on them, shall be guided to their end in its plenitude and blessedness, the mercy of the Saviour clinging to them, whether in their conversion, their conflict or their crown.[76]

But those who do not belong to "the certain and

blessed number" are "most righteously judged according to their deserts, lying under the sin inherited by procreation or by their choice." Some of them receive grace for a season, but "as they have not received the gift of perseverance, they are sent away by the righteous and secret Counsel of God" --- *judicio Dei justo et occulto.*[77]

God's Counsel is secret in two ways: His decision is based on no rational, human criterion, but is forever incomprehensible; and it is not disclosed to men, lest the reprobate despair and the elect become slothful. Why God did not save everyone is likewise unknown to us; thus, if St Paul, declared in his first letter to Timothy (2:4), that "He wills all men to be saved and come to the knowledge of the truth," we must understand that, according to Augustine, the Apostle means "among the predestined there is every kind of person" --- *ut intelligantur omnes praedestinati; quia omne genus hominum in eis est.*[78]

Curiously, the saved, the elect, those predestined to glory might not, according to Augustine, belong to the historical Church. Their visible membership in the Church, the Body of Christ, is the necessary means of salvation. The Bishop of Hippo cannot endorse St Cyprian's comparison of the sacerdotal Church with the Ark of Noah. He is certain only that a "few" are saved by faith, a faith which they possess by virtue of their predestination to glory.[79] Augustine was thus precursor to the Reform idea of the Church, that is, "the true Church" as composed of the "elect" or those who are secretly predestined to glory. More will be said on the subject of his ecclesiology in the next chapter.

FOOTNOTES

1. "The Augustinian Conception of Grace," in *Studia Patristica* II, pp. 268-269.

2. *Ibid.*, p. 264.

3. *Ibid.*, p. 258.

4. J.W. Trigg says that "Augustine's immensely influential handling of Biblical symbols was in the Origenist tradition" (*Origen: The Bible and Philosophy in the Third Century*, Atlanta, 1973, p. 251). One cannot be certain whether by "Origenist tradition" Trigg means "allegorism" or "typology". Origen used both. That Augustine understood the Scriptures in more than one sense, including the literal, is not the reason for our criticism of his Scriptural exegesis; it is rather the twisting of texts to fit his doctrinal innovations.

5. *Gen. ad. litt.* I, 11, 4-6 PL 34 248-249; and Origen, *Hom. in Gen.* I, 2 PG 12 147A-149B.

6. See N.P. Williams, *The Ideas of the Fall and of Original Sin*, p. 320.

7. When he reviewed this work in his *Retractions*, Augustine was alarmed by its kinship to Origen's eschatology, most especially the idea of a universal purgatory. He made some revisions (I, vii, 6 PL 32 593-594).

8. Augustine strongly censured Origen for characterizing the body as a "prison of the soul" and the physical world as created to punish disobedient spirits. For his friend, Orosius, Augustine wrote the treatise, *Contra Priscillianistas et Origenistas* in 415; and later,

De anima et eius origine (420). The theme of these works Augustine had already explained in a letter to his close friend, Januarius (400). It was later entitled, *De incarnatione Verbi*. See also *Gen. ad litt.* X, 11, 19 415-416.

9. As early as 395, when Augustine published *De libero arbitrio*, he was confronted with four possibilities concerning the origin of the soul: 1) it is propagated from the souls of the parents; 2) it is created by God with the body; 3) it is created separately and only later placed in the body; 4) created souls exist independently from the body with which it chooses to unite. Which theory best supports the theory of Augustine's idea of "original sin"? He "inclined toward the first view, later called 'spiritual traducianism' or 'generationism', since he thought it accounted better for the transmission of original sin, without impairing the goodness and justice of God (*Ep.* 166.3, 6-5, 14). On the other hand, it does not readily account for the sinlessness of Christ (*Ep.* 167. 7)" (J.M. Colleran's translation and annotation of *St Augustine, the Greatness of the Soul* and *The Teacher*, in *Ancient Christian Writers* [vol.9], Westminster [Md.], 1950, p. 195).

10. *Contra Faust.* XXVI, 4-5 PL 42 481-482. "Foreknowledge and predestination both became causative and inescapable [for Augustine]," observes Henry Chadwick, "and some careful reinterpretation of the concept of free choice became necessary, if predestination was to retain morality" ("Christian Platonism in Origen and in Augustine," in *Origenia Tertia: the Third International Colloquium for Origen Studies* [The University of Manchester, 7th-11th, 1981], ed. by R. Hanson & H. Crouzel, Rome, 1985, p. 225).

11. *Ibid.*, p. 230.

12. I cannot leave the subject without noting the similarity between Augustine and Origen on the kinship of God and man. "The mind," writes Origen, "bears a certain relationship to God, of Whom the mind itself is a noetic image, and by means of this, it comes to a knowledge of the divine Nature, especially if the mind is purified and separated from bodily matter" (*De princ.* I, i,

7 PG 11 127AB). See B. Altaner, "Augustinus und Origenes," *Historisches Jahrbuch* LXX (1951), 15-41.

13. Eibel, H., *Augustinus und die Patristik*, Muenchen, 1923, 280.

14. Van der Meer, F., *Augustine the Bishop: the Life and Work of A Father of the Church*, trans. by B. Baltershaw & G.R. Lamb, London, 1961, p. 561.

15. The terms --- "sufficient" and "efficacious grace" --- originate in the Scholastic era. Following Ambrosiaster, Augustine insisted that all grace is "prevenient" and "cooperative." He recognized two levels of grace: one given to all Christians ("sufficient grace") while saving grace ("efficacious grace") is imposed on those predestined to glory. Concerning Ambrosiaster's two categories of Christians, see F. Prat, *The Theology of St Paul* (vol.1), pp. 449-458.

16. *De praed. sanct.* XVI, 33 PL 44 983-985. Cf. St Hilary of Poitiers --- *Itaque non res indscreti judicii est electo, sed ex meriti delectu facta discreto est. Beatus ergo quem eligit Deus: beatus ob id, quia electine sit dignus* (In *Psalm LXIV*, 5 PL 9 415C).

17. All of Augustine's non-Christian sources abhorred sex and marriage. Plotinos hated his body; he never bathed. For Origen both were a chastisement. The Manicheans saw all matter (hence, the human body; therefore, sex and marriage) as the principle of evil. Augustine recognized the sanctifying power of the Sacrament of marriage; but sex remained for him a necessary evil, i.e., for the propagation of the human race. Not even grace could redeem it (See *Contra Faustus*. XXIV, 1 PL 42 274).

18. See J.J. O'Meara, "The Conditions of the Controversy," *Augustinian Studies* IV (1973), 203.

19. *Contra Jul.* IV, xvi 30 PL 44 718.

20. *Op.cit.*, IV, xxiv, 54 730. The word *reatum* (from

reatus) is used by Augustine to signify the guilt of original sin; the *actus* is its consequences. In Baptism, the *acti* are removed, but not the *reatus*. Augustine compared the latter to a wound and the *actus* to the sword withdrawn from it (*De nupt. et concup.*, I, xxvi, 29 PL 44 430).

21. *Ibid.*, III, vii, 15 709.

22. *Ibid.*, VI, xxiii, 52 729. Julian, citing St John Chrysostom and other Fathers against Augustine's idea of original sin, heard the Bishop of Hippo reply that the Fathers only denied "personal guilt" to infants, not the involuntary and unavoidable guilt they inherit from Adam. "The true origin of infants," Augustine retorted, "from which they were to be born, was Adam (*in Adam fuit*). Since the source is vitiated, all are condemned through sin..." (*Ibid.*, VI, xxv, 58 732).

23. Prat is a Roman Catholic scholar who is very critical of Augustine's Scriptural exegesis. He appears to favor the method of the Greek Fathers. Nevertheless, he agrees with Augustine's rendering of Romans 5:12 (*The Theology of St Paul* [vol. I], p. 215).

24. *Ibid.*, p. 450.

25. *Ibid.*, p. 451.

26. Augustine's belief in the eternal decree of God to save some and reprobate others is nowhere better illustrated than in the story of Jacob and Esau (*De div. Quaest. ad Simpl.*, 2 110-128).

27. "The slenderness of the Biblical foundation upon which Augustine's theory rests," states Professor N.P. Williams, "the reader will realize when it is pointed out that of his five proof-texts three are mistranslations. The appeal to tradition, in so far as it is not mere assertion, bases itself upon an alleged consensus of the Fathers; but it is impossible not to observe that the Fathers whom Augustine quotes are for the most part Western" (*The Ideas of the Fall...*, p. 379). J.M. Rist concurs. With regard to Romans 5:12 he affirms

that "Augustine repeatedly misquotes St Paul to the effect that all have sinned in Adam" ("Augustine on Free Will and Predestination", *Journal of Theological Studies* XX [1969], 430).

Early in the last century, G.F. Wiggers explained that "the Fathers before Augustine were entirely at variance with him and in agreement with Pelagius [?]. They, like Pelagius, founded predestination on foreknowledge...not the unconditional predestination of Augustine, but the conditional predestination of Pelagius. The Massilians had... the full right to affirm... that Augustine's doctrine of predestination was opposed to the teaching of the Fathers and the mind of the Church...and no ecclesiastical author had ever yet explained the Epistle to the Romans (e.g., Rom. 5:12) as Augustine had, nor in such a way that grace showed no respect for the merits of the elect. It was only by doubtful inference, too, that he appealed to Sts Cyprian, Ambrose and Gregory of Nazianzus, etc..." (*Versuch einer pragmatischen Darstellung der Augustinismus und Pelagianismus* [bd. I], Hamburg, 1821, 448).

28. Some commentaries on the epistles of St Paul which were at first attributed to St Ambrose were later identified as the work of an unknown writer (c. 370) named *Ambrosiaster* or "pseudo-Ambrose" by Erasmus in 1527. Augustine was aware of these writings and he knew that the Saint did not compose them, because he gave the author the pseudonym, "St Hilarius." Some scholars believe that this "Hilarius" was in fact Decimus Hilarianus Hilarius, proconsul of Africa around 377. Professor Alex Souter also ascribes *Quaestiones Vestris et Novi Testamenti* to Ambrosiaster, not to Augustine (*Study of Ambrosiaster*, Cambridge [Eng.], 1905), the conventional attribution.

According to E. Buonaiuti, it was the mysterious Ambrosiaster who taught Augustine to equate the Manichean ἡ βῶλος with St Paul's φύραμα ("lump"). Thus, Adam's apostasy made of the human race a *massa perditionis*, a radically and fatally wicked "mass of iniquity" or "conglomeration of perversity." "This is an understanding of human nature which Augustine clearly delineates in a letter to St Paulinus of Nola (*Ep.CLVXXX*, 18 PL 33 822-823). See "The Genesis of St Augustine's Idea of Original Sin," *The Harvard Theological Review*

X, 2 1917), 123f.

29. The Greek is: Διὰ τοῦτο ὥσπερ δι' ἑνὸς ἀνθρώπου ἡ ἁμαρτία εἰς τὸν κόσμον εἰσῆλθε, καὶ διὰ τῆς ἁμαρτίας ὁ θάνατος, καὶ οὕτως εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους ὁ θάνατος διῆλθεν' ἐφ' ᾧ πάντες ἥμαρτον. Augustine understood these words to mean: "Wherefore as by one man sin entered the world and death by sin; so death passed to all men, for (because) all have sinned."

The key phrase is ἐφ' ᾧ (ἐπὶ τούτῳ ὅτι). Does it refer to Adam ("one man") or "death"? L. Morris says to translate it as "in whom all have sinned" (Augustine) gives a strange twist to επι, for there is no direct connection between επι and "one man" (*The Epistle to the Romans*. Grand Rapids, 1988, p. 230 note 48).

E. Stauffer says επι, with its relative pronoun, refers to the preceding θάνατος (ἐφ' ᾧ = ἐπὶ θανάτῳ) and does not mean, as most translations from the Greek suppose, "on the basis of" or "because of" (cf. Phil. 4:10; II Tim. 2:14); but the connection with "death" is "gramatically required by the *chiasmus* of Romans 5:12 (διὰ ἁμαρτίας - θάνατος *and* ἐπ' θανάτῳ - ἥμαρτον)". Here ἐπὶ is the reciprocal preposition to διά in the first phrase; hence, "death, to which they fell man by man through their sin" (*New Testament Theology*. trans. by J. Marsh. New York, 1955, p. 270 note 176).

Fr Romanides asserts that ἐφ' ᾧ, as referring to Adam, is both "gramatically and exegetically impossible." Such an explanation was first proposed by Origen for the sake of his theory of the "seminal identity" of the human race (souls) with Adam. The dubious interpretation of ἐφ' ᾧ as "because" was first introduced in the East by St Photios who claimed that there are two interpretations prevalent in the Church --- referring to either "Adam" or "death" --- and he chose to interpret the phrase εφ' ᾧ as "because" (διοτι) on the basis of a faulty interpretation of II Cor. 5:4 where he takes ἐφ' ᾧ to mean "because": but the phrase refers here to σκήνει...ἐφ' ᾧ θέλομεν ἐκδύσασθαι. At the same time, St Photios "nowhere accepts the teaching that all men are made guilty for the sin of Adam" ("Original Sin According to Saint Paul", *St Vladimir's Seminary Quarterly* IV, 1-2 (1955-1966), 20-26).

Although St Photios renders ἐφ'ᾧ as διότι, he

does not ignore the traditional understanding of Adam's sin as the cause of death to his posterity --- ἐφ', ᾧ, τῷ Ἀδάμ οἱ δὲ, ἐφ' ᾧ τῶ θανάτω συνπακούντες ἀποδιδόασιν. Moreover, ἐφ' ᾧ refers to a specific or representative person. Adam having sinned and been condemned exacted the consequence of death on the human race (*Ad Amph.* LXXXIV PG 101 553C-556B).

D. Weaver summarizes the issue in his article on the subject. He concludes that the interpretations of ἐφ' ᾧ among the Greek Fathers was diverse and "contrasts sharply with the uniformity of interpretation in the Latin West" which impose "an artificial grammatical clarity on the text" (Rom. 5:12). Whatever the validity of this dubious criticism of the Latin Fathers, it is clear, as we have seen, that they agree with the Greek Fathers on the question of "inherited guilt."

Two ideas clerly emerge from the exegesis of Romans 5:12 by the Greek Fathers: "first, that humanity has inherited φθορά, πάθος and θνητοτης as the immediate motivation for sinful behavior; and secondly, an explicit rejection of 'the sin of nature'; that is to say, of a transmission or inheritance of guilt..." ("The Exegesis of Romans 5:12 Among the Greek Fathers and Its Implication for the Doctrine of Original Sin: the 5th - 12th Centuries," *St Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* XXIX, 3 (1985), 251).

30. We do not know the extent of Augustine's ability with the Greek language, although most scholars agree it was poor. Yet, many writings of the Greek Fathers were available to him in Latin translation, often in anthologies.

31. *Comm. in Ep.* ad Rom. X, 1 PG 60 474.

32. *Sermo CXI* PL 52 507A.

33. "Original Sin According to St Paul," 21.

34. *Contra Jul.* V, iv, 14 PL 44 792-793.

35. *Comm. in Ep. ad.* XV, 1 PG 60 541.

36. *Comm. in Ep. ad Rom.* VIII PG 74 829A. Cf. St Cyril

of Jerusalem, *Procat.*, 1 PG 33 33A; St Basil the Great, *Adv. Eun.* V PG 29 742C; St Athanasios, *Ep. ad Serap.* I, 24 PG 26 588B.

37. Prat, *The Theology of St Paul* (vol. I), p. 443.

38. *Comm. in Ep. ad Rom.* XV, 1 541.

39. Among the Latin Fathers, see St Ambrose, *De fid.* V, 83 [Rom. 8:29] PL 16 665; and St Jerome, *Ep. CXX ad Hed.*, X PL 22 1000.

40. Augustine never completed his commentary on the Romans begun in 393. He, nonetheless, continued to quote certain verses from it as if his exegesis of the Epistle was accurate.

41. *De div. Quaes. oct.*, Q. 58, 2 PL 40 42.

42. See footnotes 26; and R. Wilson-Kastner, "Grace as Participation in the Divine Life in the Theology of Augustine of Hippo," *Augustinian Studies* VII (1976), 135-152.

43. The words of St John Chrysostom come to mind: "He justified them by the laver of regeneration...and glorified them by grace through the adoption of sons" --- Ἐδικαίωσε διὰ τῆς τοῦ λοῦτροῦ παλιγγένεσιας...Ἐδόξασε διὰ τῆς χάριτος διὰ τῆς ὑιοθέσιας (*Comm. in Ep. ad. Rom.* XV, 2 PG 60 541) --- that is, through Baptism and incorporation into the Church, the Body of Christ. He who belongs to the Church is a brother to Him Who is the Son of God. If a brother, then, a son of God by adoption through the Holy Spirit (Rom. 8:14-19).

44. *De div. Quaest. ad Simpl.* II, 15 PL 40 120.

45. Reuter says that it came "*nicht kontinuerlichen Fortschritt, sondern in den Wirren das dialektischen Suchens, welches endigt mit Finden der predestinatian Gnade*" (*Augustinische Studien*, 10). During the Pelagian controversy, Augustine's doctrine of predestination or divine predetermination was articulated fully.

46. *On the Gift of Perseverance*, 53 (*Nicean Post-Nicean Church Fathers* [vol. 8], ed. by P. Schaff & H. Wace, Buffalo, 1887).

47. *Contra epp. Pelag.* II, 1 PL 44 571.

48. *De nat. et. grat.*, 8 PL 44 251.

49. See the discussion N.P. Williams, *The Ideas of Sin and Original Sin*, pp. 550-554.

50. *De pecca. merit. et remis.* III, v, 11 PL 44 191; and *hoc de originali peccato apud Ecclesiae fidem tanta constantia custoditum* (*op. cit.*, 194).

51. *Ench.*, 26-27 PL 40 245.

52. *De pecca. merit. et remis.* I, xi, 13 116.

53. *Ibid.*, II, 4 152.

54. *De Trin.* XIII, xii, 16 1026.

55. *Ibid.*, XIII, xiii, 21 1031.

56. St Paul exclaimed, "The sting of death is sin" --- τὸ δὲ κέντρον τοῦ θανάτου ἡ ἁμαρτία (I Cor. 15:56) Thus, we sin, because we die; and, necessarily, we die as a consequence of our sins. More exactly, Adam sinned and he, along with his posterity, dies. Mortality is the cause of human corruption --- the passions --- which are the dynamics of sin. Human sinfulness confirms human mortality. Augustine changed the sense of St Paul's words. "Because sin is the sting of death," he writes, "it is the sting by whose stroke death occurs, not the sting with which death strikes" (*Contra epp. Pelag.* IV, 7 614). On the contrary, since the immortal cannot sin, "the sting of death is sin."

57. *De grat. Christi et pecca. orig.* II, xi, 45 PL 44 407-408.

58. *Contra epp. Pelag.* II, v, 9 577. Cf. *De corr. et grat.*, XI, 31 PL 44 935.

59. *De nupt. et concup.* I, xxvi, 29 PL 44 430.

60. *Ench.*, 32 248.

61. *De corr. et grat.*, XI, 14 924.

62. *Op.cit.*, 16 925. According to Rist ("Augustine on Free Will and Predestination," 465) when Augustine used the phrase, "Many are called, but few are chosen," he meant that salvation is entirely the work of God. Man has no part in it whatsoever.

63. *The Grace of God*, p. 49.

64. See John Calvin, *The Eternal Predestination of God*, p. 98.

65. *De praed. sanct.*, XVII, 34 PL 44 985.

66. *Ibid.*, XVIII, 37 987.

67. *The Gift of Perseverance*, 9 (NPNF).

68. *Ibid.*, 19.

69. "Freedom [for Augustine]," says R.A. Greer, "is really to be equated with election and perseverance in the good" ("The Analogy of in Theodore of Mopsuestia's Christology," *The Journal of Theological Studies* XXXIV [1938], 97).

70. *Ench.*, 98-100 189.

71. *De anima et orig.*, IV, xi, 16 PL 44 533.

72. *De perf. just. hom.* XI, 28 PL 44 305; *De gestis Pel.* III, 7 PL 44 323-324.

73. *De corr. et grat.*, XII, 36 938. Calvin would say, "There could be no election without reprobation"

(*Institutes of the Christian Religion* [vol. 3], trans. by F.L. Battles, Philadelphia, 1960, III, 23:1).

74. *Ibid.*, 38 940.

75. *Ibid.*, XIII, 39 940.

76. *Ibid.*, 40 941.

77. *Ibid.*, 42 942.

78. *Ibid.*, XIV, 44 943. Cf. Calvin's *The Eternal Predestination of God*, p. 95.

79. *De Praed. Sanct.*, XVII, 34 985.

Chapter V

Augustine: The Other Errors

Each doctrinal error of Augustine is consistent with all his others, stemming from principles which allowed him to elaborate a peculiar and coherent body of religious opinion. His theology, cosmology, christology, mystagogy, historiosophy, etc. are interwoven. Although, one cannot argue that he constructed a "Christian *Weltanschauung" à la* Thomas Aquinas or George Hegel (who owe him much), yet the Bishop of Hippo's religio-philosophical speculations are cohesive, a vision of things now and forever.

Those speculations, however, brought him into conflict with the Christian Tradition, if not always in their content, surely in their form. For example, his christology is both "nestorian" (dualist) and "monophysite" (monergist): the first with regard to the two natures in Christ and the second to his understanding of Christ's salvation.[1] That he was probably oblivious to these equations is no less a mistake than employing christological (and soteriological) tenets not found "in the faith once delivered to the saints" (Jude 3). We will see the way in which such aspects of his thought ultimately

dovetail.

His need to reconcile Hellenism and Christianity or, what is tantamount to the same thing, "faith" and "reason," was the cause of Augustine's blindness. Behind this error, lay the passion for theoretical certainty; nay, more, the emotional guarantee of his salvation. No doubt there were some aspects of Christianity that Augustine --- for reasons of his own --- could not or would not rationalize; and, consequently, he made the logical move, an appeal to "authority"; indeed, a move wholly within the bounds of his system and his need.

Below several sides of Augustinianism are examined. His philosophical principles, although not always explicit, furnish the background for them. The results of our examination will show, among other things, that the thought of Augustine is not congenial to the mind of the Orthodox Church.

1. The Mind of the Church

The modern idea of "the development of dogma" has no meaning for the Orthodox Church. She teaches that the present generation of the Faithful believes precisely what was held by the first generation, that is, exactly what the Lord commanded His Apostles to propagate. She acknowledges, of course, the organic evolution of doctrinal formulae, of liturgical forms and ecclesiastical symbols, that is, the divine Truth put into words and images from time to time and with the specific reason of reaffirming that Truth for the Faithful in the face of heresy and unbelief.[2]

Although counciliar decrees open with the words, "Following the holy Fathers," she does not mean to

suggest that the Christian Faith originated with them; rather she accepts their *testimony* as truth. The Orthodox Church proclaims that the Holy Spirit has given to the holy Fathers the grace to rightly interpret the Scriptures and discern the saving truth. He speaks through them as He spoke through the Evangelists and Apostles.[3] Indeed, the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments are the highest literary authority in the Church.

In other words, the Church professes what was "traditioned" to her by Jesus Christ Himself (Matt. 28:18-20). If, then, she has occasionally given verbal and artistic expression to what she has never ceased to uphold, she has been motivated primarily by self-protection: she reacts to a hostile environment which seeks to deny or misrepresent her guardianship.[4] In this way, later Christian writers have said what previously has been left unsaid, leaving the impression, in the minds of some, that the Church has altered her creed. In fact, the Holy Spirit Who "guides her into all truth," does not allow her children to experiment with the Faith Christ delivered to them. Orthodoxy has no "creative theology."

Only he is her spokesman, a Father, who lives the evangelic life and pursues her wisdom, her mind --- τὸ ἐκκλησιαστικὸν φρόνημα. One may not always speak well, but yet possess that "mind"; and, conversely, one may speak very well, with "tongues of men and of angels," and fail to share in it. Once appropriated, the "mind" of the Church gives access to unimagined noetical treasures. At the same time, one cannot possess that "mind," save her sons. He must not only belong to the Orthodox Church, but must have zealously embraced her life and her wisdom. To quote St Cyril of Jerusalem,

"True religion consists of two elements: pious doctrine and virtuous action."[5]

Yet, "true religion" does not demand absolute uniformity. The Church permits diversity of style and form. Circumstance often dictates the means by which her sons proclaim the Christian Gospel. Thus, if the Fathers of the East and the West, on account of circumstance, treated various aspects of the Christian Faith differently, they, nevertheless, shared a common *mind*. How else could Sts Firmilian of Cesarea and Cyprian of Carthage have agreed on the question of "heretical Baptism"? or Sts Athanasios and Pope Julian on the divine Nature of Christ? or Sts Ambrose and Gregory the Theologian on the Eucharist? or Sts Basil the Great and Benedict of Nursia on monasticism?

They shared the same *phronema*, the same vision, the same Spirit which disclosed to them what Fr Justin Popovich described as *theanthropisme*: christology as "the supreme value of Orthodoxy",[6] that is, Christ, "one and the same Christ, Son, Lord, Only-begotten, recognized in two natures, without confusion, without change, without division, without separation, the distinction of natures in no way annulled by the union" (Definition of Chalcedon).[7] He is "the Wisdom of God," "the Form of all things," their "Archetype," the unity of the temporal and the eternal, the visible and the invisible, the mutable and the immutable, "intertwined," as St Dionysios the Areopagite said. Two realities are conjoined without denaturing each other.

Orthodox christology has cosmological and/or ontological implications. When St John the Theologian announced that the Christ, the Messiah, is "the alpha and the omega," He alluded to much more than His role

as Creator and Judge. When the Scriptures describe Him as "the first-born from the dead" (Rev. 1:5), they refer to Him as the type or adumbration of the future man. In His resurrected humanity He anticipates the Age to Come. He is already what will be; and likewise His Church, His Body. The Church, writes St John Chrysostom, is "the Age to Come," "the Eighth Day," "the Day of the Lord."

In other words, the present and the future are bound together "without separation or confusion," without losing their identities while, at the same time, the future is now. Thus, for example, the Mysteries or Sacraments of the Church, are types of the Age to Come. So it is that all created things are a reflection --- an icon of Him Who is "the Wisdom of God." Without Him Who is "the Light of the World" (John 1:1-14) the human intellect must take the long journey into the darkness with no promise of discovery.

Mortality and sin have clouded the "noetic eyes" of the fallen man. Not only is he plagued with delusion, but his reason is bedeviled by extremes (e.g., materialism or spiritualism, realism or nominalism, collectivism or individualism, etc.), and he is frustrated by the fact that he is unable to operate outside certain patterns of thought: no matter how hard the "natural" or "fallen man" tries to find "new solutions" for his problems, they turn out to be old ones.

His egotism denies him the ability to soar beyond the finite and decaying limits his immanent experience. The infinite "knowledge" of the "regenerate man," however, is the reward of faith and a function of his life in the Spirit. Surely that "knowledge" is free and rational --- truly free (dispassionate) and truly

rational (renewed) --- the "freedom" and "rationality" of the person becoming divine.

Christianity, therefore, offers an extraordinary knowledge; and it is much more than the "illumination" of the human mind in its present condition. For, indeed, knowledge as it is, "natural knowledge," languishes in a most "unnatural condition," or as St Gregory of Sinai said, "For a man to be rational, that is to say, rational according to nature, as he was in the beginning, he must become passionless...as the Saints who achieved rationality through purity; then only does he return to his original state and the mind beholds God and receives divine knowledge (γνωσις) from Him. Instead of a book, he now has the Spirit..."[8]

Consequently, he saw reality in a different light, different from those who people the race of Adam. According to the Orthodox, the Spirit of God, Who teaches the Church all things (John 14:26), has disclosed to her and, consequently, to her Fathers, a new and special way of knowledge. Her children have access by this "knowledge" to all spiritual truth, even to Him Who is beyond all knowing. Therefore, the believer is conscious of created being as mondual: the sensible in the noetical. He knows the these two dimensions are interrelated and that the latter presupposes time and space. Creation imitates its Creator.

He does not make the mistake of the "monophysite" who, losing the human in the Divine, must propound a pantheistic cosmology and history, a false idea of man and culture.[9] Neither does the believer conceive reality dualistically, as the "nestorian" --- as Augustine --- views it: the sensible and noetical side by side, the former only a pale reflection of the

higher reality. The end of "nestorianism" is secularism, in every sense of the word.[10] Not unlike monism, including the monophysite type, "nestorian dualism" cannot justify the unity of created reality. Hence, only the Christian ontology --- christology --- prevents time and history from foundering in a labyrinth of endless becoming or evaporating in a timeless Ideal.

As a "chalcedonian," St Maximos the Confessor conceived created existence to be the unity of the visible and the invisible, a unity ensured by "the unique modes of the invisible and unknowable presence in them, the cause which holds them together, albeit without confusing or dividing them in their unity."[11] The ontology of St Maximos was, of course, no more than the Tradition of the Church. The two-natured, single Personality of Christ, as we said, is the model for his monodual ontology, something which neither monistic "monophystism" nor dualistic "nestorianism" --- nor, indeed, Augustine --- may legitimately claim.

We have some idea already where Augustine stood with regard to the Church's "theanthropy."[12] The fact that he failed to develop his ontology (or soteriology) in christological terms plays him false.

2. Christology

The christology of Augustine is scattered throughout his writings, although he sometimes dedicated, as in the case of his letter to Volusian (*Ep.* 137), an entire discourse to the subject of the Incarnation. It is characteristic of Augustine that, while never denying that Christ is God and man, he was wont to say that the two natures are interlocked. His

reluctance may have been founded not only in his desire to protect the integrity of the Creator, but in his Platonic (and Manichean?) presuppositions.

a. Augustine's description of the pre-Incarnate Christ as "the Beginning" of creation, after close examination, clearly reveals his dependence on pagan thought. For instance, the *Verbum* of Augustine played the same role in his system as the *Noûs* in the cosmogony of Plotinos, that is, as the "the Beginning": the ἐν ἀρχῇ or *principium* of the world according to the divine Ideas. Augustine believed that both the book of Genesis and the prologue of St John's Gospel, identify Him, the Word or *Verbum*, as "the origin of created being...in its imperfect and formless state... In Him Who is the Beginning, Holy Scriptures place the origin of created being, which exists through Him..."[13]

b. In seeking to define the unity of the human and Divine in the Word become flesh --- Christ, the new "Beginning" --- Augustine used several metaphors, including marriage, the habitation of a military dwelling and his favorite figure, the union of body and soul.[14] According to J. McWilliam-Dewart, the relationship between body and soul "provided a metaphor for a union of the two realities," allowing him to express the union of God and man as "mutually present, but distinct."[15] To be more more precise, Augustine permits the Word of God to join only with the human soul --- *quomodo anima humana Verbo Dei copuletur* (*Ep.* CXXVII PL 33 515-525; *Ep.* CXL, 4, 12 PL 33 542) --- not directly with the whole man.

Perhaps, the reason for his christology is found in the influence of Marius Victorinus in whose writings he found --- *Non igitur adsumpsit hominem, sed factus est homo* (*Adv. Ar.* I, 22); or, perhaps, the words of

Theodore of Mopsuestia that the union of the Logos with man was κατα χαριν not, as the Fathers taught, κατ' ουσιαν.[16] In other words, the humanity and Divinity of Christ are "mated" by grace, created grace; there is no "assumption" of a complete human nature from the Virgin Mary.[17]

Seemingly unaware of the implications of this dualism, Augustine conceded only indirect contact between the Word and His body, by "mediation of the soul," since it alone is immaterial like God. As he wrote to Volusian:

> For as the soul makes use of the body in a single person to form a man, so God makes use of a man in a single person to form Christ. In the former person, there is a mingling of soul and body; in the latter, a mingling of God and man...when the Word of God unites to the soul which has a body, taking thereby both soul and body at once...it ought to be easier to intermingle two incorporeal things rather than one incorporeal and the other corporeal.[18]

Thus, in Augustine's perception, the gap to be bridged is greater between body and soul than between the Word and the human soul; or, as Grillmeier comments, "it is the Godhead and the soul which are directly united in Him...and man is only joined to the Godhead by means of the soul."[19]

Quomodo anima humana Verbi Dei copuletur: the soul is *anima mediante*.[20] Augustine was repelled by the notion that flesh might defile spirit. "How much less, then, could a female body pollute the Word of God --- Who is neither corporeal nor visible --- when He took flesh from her [Theotokos] along with a soul and spirit

through the incoming of which the Majesty of the Word dwells in less immediate conjunction with the frailty of the human body," Augustine declared. The Word of God "can in no way have been defiled by a human body, by which the human soul remains undefiled, so long as it rules and vivifies the body; and if the soul abstains from carnal things."[21]

Augustine was not satisfied with this christology; it lacked precision and invited objections. As a philosopher, he wanted to leave no doubts, no "loose ends." Consequently, in *De Trinitate*, he went further:

> Wherefore, since the Son is both God and man, the manhood in the Son is more another substance than the Son in the Father, just as the flesh of my soul is more another substance than my soul --- although one person --- than is the soul of another man to my soul.[22]

The statement "the manhood in the Son is more another substance than the Son in the Father" (*alia substantia homo potius in Filio quam Filius in Patre*) is clearly heretical, for if Augustine is right, then, "the concrete man-being, the *homo* in Christ, is nothing other than the God-Son Himself while the Son is not personally identified with the Father, but is rather opposed to Him as a different Person."[23]

In effect, trying to explain the Incarnation with his philosophical bias, Augustine threw doubt on the consubstantiality of the Son with both man and God. At best, he fell into the error of Apollinaris of Laodicea (whose writings he studied in Rome); or, at worst, into some kind of polytheism. Again, if the Bishop of Hippo meant that the man Jesus and the Person of God the Son

are consubstantial --- through the soul --- then, the hypostatic function, in fact, extends to Christ's humanity. If there is a "substantial" difference between Father and Son on account of the latter's humanity, then, the Trinity Itself has been mutilated by the Incarnation.

May we argue, as many have, that Augustine did not really deny the Incarnation nor distort the Christian witness to the Holy Trinity, that is, his errors were verbal and not doctrinal? I think not. He is not faulted for hyperbole or prolixity, but rationalism. His thinking shows that Augustine hoped to elevate "faith" into "reason" and it is this enterprise which betrays him.

3. Soteriology. St Ambrose and St Leo

Augustine was an innovator not, as some think, a summator. He did not perfect the christology (and, therefore, the doctrine of salvation) of St Ambrose; nor did he inspire the *Tome* of St Leo. He was no "Chalcedonian before Chalcedon."[24] Unlike the Latin Fathers, Ambrose and Leo, with whom his apologists wish to associate his name, Augustine, by his own admission, deviated from the Tradition they humbly reaffirmed.

First of all, *St Ambrose* was unspeculative. He made, in the light of circumstance (e.g., the struggle with Arianism) some simple yet profound statements about the Incarnation and the union of the two natures. Thus, he declared that "if anything is wanting in Him as a man, Christ did not redeem the whole man"[25] which is tantamount to saying, "what is not assumed is not saved" (St Gregory the Theologian). "He assumed what is mine," Ambrose wrote, "that we might share what is

His. He assumed it not to confuse, but to complete. If you accept the assumption, and invent no confusion, surely you have ceased to be a Manichean and have become a son of the Church."[26]

Again, "He received from us what He offered as His own for us, that He might redeem us from our own," the Saint added, "and that He might confer on us from the liberality of His Divinity, what was not our own. According to our nature, then, He offered Himself, that He might do a work beyond our nature" (*De Sacr. et Incar. Dom.* VI, 54 867B). Although the two natures of Christ are inseparable, "what He assumed is one thing; that He assumed is another" (VI, 61 869B). He "assumed a rational soul" (VII, 66 869B).

"He took on flesh that He might raise it again; He took on a soul, a perfect human and rational soul", wrote St Ambrose (VII, 66 870D). "I do not divide Christ when I distinguish the substance of His flesh and His Divinity; but I proclaim one Christ..." (VII, 77 873AD). Consequently, "He participates in our humanity with His Divinity and grants us to participate in His Divnity" (VIII, 85 875BC), because through His Incarnation He rescued "the works of His Hands from the slavery of corruption; and by the sufferings of His own body, He overthrew him [devil] who had the power of death."[27]

St Ambrose made no effort to justify the unity of the Divine and the human in Christ. It is enough for him to repeat what was said about the Incarnation before him and to articulate its soteriological implications. *St Leo* did nothing more. Like St Ambrose, "his doctrine concerning our Lord's Person has its ground in certain clearly defined soteriological ideas."[28] The *Tome* which he presented to the Council

of Chalcedon (451) made a simple christological statement:

> The birth in time in no way detracted from, nor added to, the divine and eternal Birth; but expended itself wholly in the work of restoring man who had been deceived, 'so that He might overcome death and destroy the power of the devil who had the power of death' (Heb. 2:14). For we could not have overcome the author of sin and death, unless He who could not be contaminated by sin, nor detained by death, had taken upon Himself our nature and made it His own.

God the Son became the Son of Man without losing His identity as the Deity nor abrogating the human nature He took from the Theotokos. Each nature retained its own properties --- *Tenet enim sine defectu proprietatem suam utraque natura.*

The unity of the natures is necessary for the contact between Creator and creature. There is no other way for it to be saved, for none could be "ransomed from the tyrant" without God. Unless Christ were genuinely human, He could not bestow immortality. If He were not God-Man, He could not overcome our mortality. "Therefore, in the entire and perfect nature of true man was born true God, complete in what was His, complete in what is ours" --- *totius in suis, totus in nostris.*[29]

Not only the *Tome*, but also in his sermons *On the Nativity* and elsewhere, Leo affirms that "unless He were true God, He could not bring us healing; unless He were true man, He could not supply the example."[30] "He could not be 'the Mediator between God and man,' if He

were not one true Person, at once God and man, existing in both natures."[31] There is no illusion in the unity of Christ, Leo asserts, for the Catholic Church teaches that in Christ there is neither true manhood without true Godhead, nor true Godhead without true manhood.[32]

The Pontiff vigorously defended the connection (*connexio*) between *Deus* and *homo* or *caro*, "the flesh He assumed from a human being which is animated with the spirit of rational life," a *soliditas* without which there can be no "assumption" (i.e., salvation) of the creature. There is, in fact, an "exchange of properties"[33] --- a fact to which Augustine gave very little attention, so concerned was he to protect God and the soul from the pollution of matter. Whatever Ambrose may have taught him, if anything, and whatever Leo may have taken from him, if anything, the Bishop of Hippo stands outside their tradition.[34]

4. The Church

The Church is the Body of Christ. She is the extension of His Divine-human Life. She is, therefore, both visible and invisible, temporal and eternal, the two dimensions united without confusion or separation. In the words of St Gregory the Great, she is one Church which has "two lives: one in time and the other in eternity."[35] As there is no access to His invisible Divinity save through His visible humanity, so there is no access to the invisible and spiritual Church save through her temporal and sacerdotal reality. Thus, she has no "hidden" or "secret" members outside her visible boundaries; there is no *Geistkirche* and *Leibkirche*.

a. Historically speaking, the unity of the Church is manifested in the Eucharist, for which reason

the Orthodox doctrine of the Church is a "eucharistic ecclesiology," as the Orthodox commonly say. Through the Eucharist, the Church in heaven and the Church on earth are "in the same place." Eternity is incarnated in time. Thus, the exhortation of St Ignatios of Antioch:

> Come together in common, one and all without exception in love, in one faith and in one Jesus Christ, Who sprang from the race of David of the flesh, the Son of Man and the Son of God, so that with undivided mind you may obey the bishop and the priests, and break the one Bread which is the medicine of immortality and the antidote to death, enabling us to live forever in Jesus Christ" (*Ep. ad Eph.*, 20).

In another letter, he urged,

> Be zealous, then, in the observance of the Eucharist. For there is one flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ, and one chalice that brings union in His Blood. There is one altar as there is one bishop with the priests and deacons... (*Ep. ad Phil.*, 4).

As Christ is one albeit with several dimensions; likewise is the Church, His Body. Consequently, the Eucharist combines both the created and Uncreated. If we conceive the Church dualistically; so likewise the Eucharist; and we must infer a division in Christ, a "nestorian" division which denies all communion with God and precludes all hope of salvation (deification), for the Church is merely a human institution and in Communing we devour only bread and wine. If, however, we conceive Christ to have but one nature, the Divine,

then, the Uncreated swallows the created with the implication that both the Church and the Eucharist have no human or created aspect; and, consequently, the Church is neither human nor historical and in consuming the Eucharist, we are consuming God Himself. Such is the preposterous conclusion to which "monophystism" forces us.

b. How must we understand Augustine's ecclesiology in terms of what has been said? By his "sermons to the People," one could almost believe that his doctrine of the Church --- and of the Eucharist --- was traditional.[37] Peering more deeply into his opinions, one begins to have doubts, especially when we remember his explanations of the "the many" and "the few" which compose the earthly Church.[38] He insists that all of her members may enjoy the Mysteries, including the Eucharist, but only "the few," "the elect," "the saved" receive their ultimate benefit. "The Church and the Sacraments" are "efficacious" only for the predestined, for "the hidden people of God," Henry Chadwick writes.[39] Those "hidden people," too, may not be members of the visible Church.

Adolph von Harnack observed that Augustine's ecclesiology does not limit the Church on earth to her visible borders, nor is she identical with the *communio sanctorum* which is only the elect or those who have received the gift of perseverance. "Thus the thought of predestination shatters every notion of the Church," Harnack maintains, "...and renders valueless all the divine ordinances, the institution and [visible] means of salvation."[40]

Augustine anticipated the ecclesiology of the Protestant Reform, especially Luther who denied the visibility of the Church --- which, christologically

speaking, is a form of Docetism. Moreover, Augustine believed that the grace of salvation overflows the sacerdotal borders of the Church. He theorized that "heretics" possess the grace to effectuate the Sacraments of the Church. "Therefore, it is possible that some who have been baptized outside the Church may be considered to have been really baptized within," he told the Donatists, while "some who seemed to have been baptized within may be understood, through the same foreknowledge [foreordination] of God, more truly to have been baptized outside of her."[41]

In a word, the Holy Spirit does not indwell the Church as in His Temple, but only in the elect who may not belong physically to the Church on earth. Thus, in the *Enchirdion*, Augustine stated that the earthly and heavenly Church are divided, the latter only known "as it is when, at the end of the age, we are joined to it." In itself the statement may be ambiguous, but it is clarified with the words that "the part [of the Church] is restored when those predestined to eternal life are redeemed from the old state of corruption" --- *cum ipsi homines qui praedestinati sunt ad aeternum vitam, a corruptionis vestustate renovantur.*[42]

c. For Augustine, then, the Church on earth contains the fellowship of true believers, the elect, but she is not herself the means of salvation. He would have agreed, as I said, with Luther that hidden within the temporal Church is the coterie of the saved --- *abscondita est ecclesia, latent sancti* --- foreknown and elected from all eternity by unqualified election. Although Augustine did not speak of two Wills in God, Luther perceived in his theology that God "is the cause whereby one sins and is damned" as well as the "cause" of righteousness in the saved.[43] Like

Augustine, the Reformer taught that neither Baptism nor repentance removes the infirmity of concupiscence, the palpable reason for the condemnation of the reprobate.

Calvin agreed with Luther and Augustine that Christ atoned only for the predestined, the true Church. One may dispute whether, like Luther, the master of Geneva denied the visibility of the Church; in point of fact, Calvin argued that the Church is visible to the eyes of faith.[44] Of course, one may insist that Augustine cannot be blamed for the use made of his teachings, but nothing in church history can explain Reform ecclesiology but Augustine.[45] Calvin, Luther, etc. ever invoked his authority. The astonishing similarity between Augustine and the Reformers is not mere coincidence.

5. The Mysteries

From the beginning the Orthodox Church has celebrated "the Mysteries of God, the sacred mystagogy."[46] Among other things,[47] they are the theurgic rites of salvation, that is to say, they constitute the participants as God's holy People. They are the divine instruments of deification. The rites not only bestow the grace of healing, the grace of perfection, but the grace of gnostic knowledge. The rites reveal to the initiated or baptized divine truths (*disciplina arcani*) not part of the Church's public preaching. The Faithful are not only enlightened and strengthened, but in the Mysteries anticipate the Age to Come, especially in Baptism (the Mystery of incorporation) and the Eucharist (the Mystery of divine fellowship).

As St John Chrysostom announced in his Liturgy,

God has "bestowed upon us Thy Kingdom which is to come" (Prayer of the Cherubim). At the same time, the initiated (μυστης) must struggle to achieve the glory which is his end, the victory of the "warrior" whose enemy is the devil (*Eph.* 6: 10-20)). The Mysteries are his weapons, for their grace is sharing in the divine Energy. They provide him with life-giving "knowledge," a "knowledge" far greater than the conceptions of the intellect. It is a "knowledge" which penetrates and changes the "heart" or noetical center of human nature. It is a "knowledge" for the overcoming of the passions. It is the γνωσις of the saving Truth.

a. Judging from Augustine's letters written prior to 400 (*Epp.*, 9, 13, 15, 55), he acknowledges that the Mysteries or Sacraments were types of the Age to Come, *sacramenti octavi*. He was not then, as he was later, intrigued by legal concepts of "validity," "efficacy," "necessity." Gradually, however, Augustine lost his wonder and reverence for the rites of salvation. On account of his philosophical mentality, his teachings on the Mysteries, like his theology in general, stressed more and more the gratuity of God's gift of grace to the prejudice of the human role in the Divine-human encounter.[48]

The Mysteries were no longer *secretum*, ritual acts by which the Faithful are "mystically" integrated into the divine Life, but *signum*. *Sacrmentum-secretum* became *sacramentum-signum*, that is, the visible sign of the presence of grace. They were revealed "because of our weakness, our 'bodiedness' --- a Neo-Platonic term --- for the Sacraments derived value from the preaching of the gospel, from the word, to which they [the Sacraments] form a sort of appendix...or, as Augustine said, ...a 'visible word'."[49]

Van der Meer states that the Sacraments "appear in Augustine's writings as a number of particularly holy and effective allegories of the process of salvation; but they do so in the company of a thousand others that are not sacraments at all, rather mere signs and indications. All boundaries become blurred and the whole creation is transformed into a mystical ladder to heaven which is erected within the narrow limits of man's own soul."[50] Thus, if the Sacraments are salvific within the bosom of the Catholic Church, it is because the "ladder into heaven" is "erected within the narrow limits" of the souls of her members who have been predestined to glory.

Furthermore, the "efficacy" of the Sacraments is not confined to the Catholic Church. Augustine upheld the so-called "validity" of "heretical Baptism" and "Ordination" (and necessarily the other Sacraments), while proclaiming the Church to be "the Temple of the Holy Spirit."[51] By this extra-ecclesial mystagogy, he set himself against the most revered teacher of Christian West Africa, St Cyprian of Carthage, while pretending to defend and extend his work. In truth, the "sacramental theology" of Augustine is not to be found in holy Tradition.[52] Calvin rightly noted that the Bishop of Hippo effected the change in the meaning of the word, Sacrament.

b. According to Augustine, every *sacramentum* has three components: the material (e.g., water, wine, oil, etc.), the Holy Spirit and the "word." The "word" and the material element are *signa*, signs. The matter and word "signify" the presence of the Spirit; but, then, every created thing (*res*) does that.[53] With regard to the Sacraments, the correct "word" (formula) and the other sensible components incite the Holy Spirit;

hence, the "valid" and "efficacious" Sacrament imitates the Incarnation. In other terms, the Sacrament is the visible sign of God's grace (*signum gratiae Dei*) or the efficacious sign of sanctifying grace (*signum efficax gratiae sanctificantis*).

The physical and spiritual aspects of the Sacrament are not merged. The aggregation of its components or elements have legal overtones: the right words and intent, even without the right faith, even if utilized outside the Church, even without promoting ecclesial unity, have a certain efficacy. "Take away the word and what is water but water?" Augustine inquired rhetorically. "Add the word to the element and there is a sacrament."[54] He also believed that the Sacraments, such as Baptism and Ordination, are indelible, not even lost or suppressed with apostasy.

c. Augustine argued that, in some sense, "heretical Baptism" and Ordination are "retained" by those who have left or been expelled from the Church; they are "valid" and transmittable. Heretics also possess a Eucharist (*Sermon* 229). However, he was quick to add, invoking the name of St Cyrpian (who called heretical rites *perverse fuerint imitati*), that the "sacraments" of heretics (and schismatics) belong not to Christ, not to those who have seceded from the unity and fellowship of the Church.[55]

To this kind of thinking, St Hilarion (Troitsky) had strong objection. Not even the genius of Augustine could reconcile the idea of the existence of Mysteries outside the Church with the Scriptural and patristic teaching of the Church as the source of mystagogical grace and unity. The Archbishop points out that Augustine supposes the "validity" of heretical rites because he maintains the efficacy of those rites as

independent of the minister's virtue.[56] But in fact, the moral condition of the priest has never been the question; it is rather his faith that is germane; or, better, the faith of the religious fellowship he represents.

Thus, Augustine:

> "finds himself in a kind of dead end, because for him the only path of salvation is *via* the Catholic Church. To recognize as valid mysteries administered outside the Church means that he recognizes the operation of grace outside the Church and in hostility towards her; in a word, this means to recognize that [the stewardship of] the Church is not obligatory; and in effect to cast away the faith in the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church."[57]

His conundrum precipitated the distinction between "to have the Sacraments" and "to have Sacraments with profit"; or, put in other language, "heretics have lawful Baptism [etc.] unlawfully" --- *Baptismum ergo legitimum habent, sed non legitime habent.*[58] Such an idea is naked innovation.

How did Augustine hope to justify this sophistry? By love, an exasperated Archbishop Hilarion exclaims,

> While possessing the mysteries, schismatics, in Augustine's opinion, are deprived of their grace-bestowing and saving effect because of their separation from the Church. This separation shows they have no love. Without love man cannot be virtuous; the Holy Spirit cannot abide in him. Thus the schismatics who [like heretics] are outside the Church, have not the Holy Spirit. This objection inevitably raises question: if schismatics [and heretics] do not have the Holy Spirit, how is their 'baptism' effectuated? Augustine makes the strange assumption that presumably at that moment the Holy Spirit operates outside the Church.[59]

Apparently, too, the Holy Spirit gives "validity" to "heretical sacraments" on account of the right "words" and "signs," leaving us with the impression that "the essence of Christianity" is "a collection of incantations by means of which man can extract from the Divinity the supernatural help he needs."[60]

The contradictions do not stop here. Having insisted that salvation exists only in "the Catholic Church" and sanctification only through the Spirit which abides in her, Augustine made another remarkable statement.

> If anyone compelled by urgent necessity, being unable to find a Catholic from whom to receive Baptism, and so, while preserving Catholic peace in his heart, should receive from one outside the pale of Catholic unity, the sacrament which he was intending to receive within the Church, should this person be suddenly dispatched from this life, he would nevertheless be deemed to be Catholic.[61]

Once again Augustine was at variance with the traditional *ubi Ecclesia, ibi et Spiritus sanctus,*[62] believing and teaching that outside the Church --- outside of Christ --- the grace of the Mysteries may be

conferred.[63]

d. On the surface, Augustine's doctrine of the Eucharist was Orthodox. For him it was a "sacrifice," with the "real presence," involving a transformation of its matter (bread and wine) by the priestly invocation of the Holy Spirit (ἐπίκλησις) and requiring the right disposition --- "spiritual eating" --- to effect the unity of the Church and spiritual change in the participant. But his mystagogy is spoiled by two factors: dualism and predestination.

The former lurks behind his exposition of the Sacrament. He distinguished between "the Sacrament" and "the virtue of the Sacrament" --- *aliud est sacramentum, aliud virtus sacramenti.*[64] The word *sacramentum* applies only to the visible and palpable aspect of the rite while *virtus* is its unseen power. *Sacramentum* is the *signum* of the *virtus*. Augustine wrote:

> If the sacraments have no resemblance to the things which they represent, they would not be sacred; indeed, not sacraments at all. They generally take the names from the things they resemble. Thus, in a certain manner the sacrament of the Body of Christ is the Body of Christ, and the Sacrament of the Blood is the Blood of Christ, even as the Sacrament of Faith [Baptism] is faith.[65]

The Bishop of Hippo cannot bring himself to bind the two aspects of the Eucharist, anymore than he could mate the two natures of Christ or the two dimensions of the Church. His reluctance led him to the grammar of subterfuge. "We live by Him," he wrote in his commentary on the Gospel of St John, "by eating

Him; that is, by receiving Him as eternal life, which we do not have from ourselves."[66] Augustine wants us to believe that eating and drinking the *sacramentum* or *signum* we somehow consume the *virtus*. He also thought to protect the believer from cannabilism with the words "figurative" or "figurative eating" which he sometimes employs, that is, ingesting the Eucharist with true faith. We may not be alone in suggesting that "figurative eating" meant for Augustine what it meant for Calvin: a "spiritual" transformation of the mystagogical elements for those who "eat" with faith.[67]

Furthermore, the Eucharist (hence, the Church) has another meaning peculiar to Augustine and his tradition:

> And thus He would have this meat and drink to be understood as meaning the society of His own Body and members, which is His holy Church, His predestined, and called and justified, and glorified saints and faithful --- *Hunc itaque cibum et potium societatem vult intelligi corporis et membrorum suorum, quod est sancta Ecclesia in praedestinatis et vocatis, et justificatis, et glorificatis sanctis, et fidelibus eius.*[68]

His pernicious theory of predestination reared its ugly head once more. Logic requires it: as the Eucharist is intrinsic to the idea of the Church, and the Church to the idea of the elect, so all three finally interface as dimensions of the same reality. Naturally, the visible and invisible aspects of this reality are collateral but never wholly conjoined.

e. Interesting, too, is Augustine's difference

with Ambrose. In *De sacramentis*, the Saint displayed the analogy between the Eucharist and the Incarnation. "Just as our Lord Jesus Christ is the true Son of God, not as a man through grace, but the Son of God from the substance of the Father, so He is true flesh, as He Himself said, which we receive as true food."[69] In his exegesis of John 6, Ambrose wrote that he who participates in the Eucharist is nourished by "His divine substance."[70]

In another place, he asked:

> Why do you look for the usual course of nature in the Body of Christ, when the Lord Himself was born of the Virgin in an extraordinary way? In truth, it is the real flesh of Christ, which was crucified and buried. So, then, also is the Sacrament of His Flesh. The Lord Himself said, 'This is My Body.' Before the blessing with the heavenly words, the bread was bread; and likewise, the wine. After the consecration, it is Blood. The Lord Himself speaks of His Blood; and you say, 'Amen,' because it is true.[71]

My professor of medieval philosopy at Calvin College described the mystagogy of St Ambrose as "mystical." He referred to "St Augustine" as "rational."

6. Theophanies and the Vision of God

The "problem" of the relationship between God and the world is a philosophical problem. In the history of Western thought, it has been members of the Platonic fraternity who have agonized over it. Origen and

Augustine were Platonists and dualists and both hoped to construct a bridge between the world of time and the world of eternity --- between God and man. They turned to Platonism for the building-blocks, whatever their trust in Genesis.[72]

The Augustinian synthesis has already been discussed at some length. His endeavor --- aside from the failure to differentiate between the divine Essence and Energy --- helps us to grasp his attitude towards the Old Testament "theophanies." He could not believe that they (e.g., God in Paradise, the Angels of Abraham's hospitality, the Burning Bush, the Angel of Great Counsel, etc.) were genuine manifestations of the Divine. His dualism (however mitigated by the Genesis cosmology) forbade it. No wonder Augustine taught that "the corporeal form of these things came into being for a purpose: to signify something and then pass away" --- *ut aliquid significaret atque praeteriret.*[73]

The Fathers expressed themselves otherwise. As an example, they took the Angel of Great Counsel --- which they identified with the divine Logos or Word --- as a principle argument in their struggle with Judaism and Hellenism.[74] On the other hand, the Bishop of Hippo agreed with the hellenizing Arians and Eunomians that the Angel was created --- even as the other *signa* of God's presence. Augustine knew very well the patristic teaching about the Angel, but preferred his own understanding.[75] He applied the same method of interpretation to Pentecost:

> If, therefore, He is said to be sent as He appeared outwardly in a bodily creature, who has always been concealed inwardly in His

> spiritual nature from the eyes of mortals, then, it becomes easy to understand about the Holy Spirit, why He, too, is said to be sent. For some form of a creature was made for the occasion in order that the Holy Spirit might be visibly manifested by means of it, whether in the bodily form of a dove or when ten days after His Ascension, on the Day of Pentecost, there suddenly came a sound from heaven... This operation, visibly manifested and offered to mortal eyes, has been called the sending of the Holy Spirit, not as if His essence itself had appeared in which He Himself is invisible and unchangeable like the Father and the Son, but in the sense that the hearts of men, being moved by these external signs, might be turned away from the temporal event of His coming to the hidden eternity of Him Who is forever present.[76]

In part, Augustine's thinking was premised on his belief that the perception of the Uncreated belongs to the Age to Come, to "the beatific vision,"[77] a kind of Neo-Platonic ecstasy of the soul within the timeless and immutable sphere of eternity (*The City of God* XXII, 29). Consequently, the God of Augustine speaks in history only indirectly to the creature, even stepping back from "enfleshment," from uniting Himself with the created. His many protests notwithstanding, Augustine retained a Manichean disdain for matter and, therefore, never allowed God firm contact with it.

Furthermore, on account of the absolute simplicity of the divine Nature, Its utter transcendence and immateriality, Augustine turned the theophanic "signs"

of the Prophets and Apostles into something created. There will be, indeed, a vision of God by the elect in the Age to Come, insists the Bishop of Hippo, since the contemplation of the divine Substance is the ultimate desire of human nature (Augustine was a eudaemonian). He imagined, says Fr Romanides, that the contemplation of God is given to all the elect as the fulness of their joy. As Augustine rhapsodized, "For we shall not seek anything else when we have come to the contemplation of Him" (*De Trin.* I, viii, 17 831). So long as man is involved in mutability and mortality, it is impossible to see God. Thus, in his present condition man can see only changeable things.[78]

The Fathers teach, however, that no creature, not in this life nor in the Age to Come, with spiritual or physical eyes, will ever "see" the Essence of God. The Councils of Constantinople in 1341, 1351, 1368, affirmed, among other things, that the divine Essence will never be an object of knowledge, whether to men or to angels. We may expect only a vision of the deified God-Man, Jesus Christ, eternal Humanity, the Christ of Glory.[79]

To some degree, that is possible even now to holy men and women. The theophanies of God are precisely manifestations of the future, the *octavus* reaching back into time, as it were. They are the presence *now* of the uncreated Glory of God. Of course, divine revelations are not monophysitically equated with God, nor are merely "nestorian" *signa* of His presence; rather the Creator manifests Himself through tangible media with which He has merged without separation or confusion.

FOOTNOTES

1. See N.P. Williams, *The Ideas of the Fall and of Original Sin*, *op. cit.*, 353f.

2. The Orthodox Church recognizes the organic evolution in the forms of Faith, not of the Faith itself. That Faith, whatever the folly of her children, has never changed from the moment it was given to her Apostles by the Lord. She has no reason to endorse Cardinal Newman's *Essay on the Development of Christian Doctrine*; nor subscribe to the not uncommon notion that the Church ought to change in order to meet the challenges of philosophy and culture; nor accede to the theory that historical circumstance has altered what she professes. She exists to transform the world, not to be transformed by it.

3. See the valuable discussion on the patristic spirit and the authority of the Fathers for the Orthodox Church in Jaroslav Pelikan's *The Christian Tradition: A History of the Development (vol. 2): The Spirit of Eastern Christendom (600-1700)*, Chicago, 1974, pp. 8-36.

4. "But the errors of heretics and blasphemers compel us to deal with unlawful matters, to scale perilous heights, to speak unutterable words, to trespass forbidden ground," says St Hilary of Poitiers. "The error of others forces us to err in daring to embody in human terms truths which ought to be hidden in the silent veneration of the heart." He reminds us that "heresy" lies in the sense assigned, not in the word written; the guilt belongs to the expositor, not his text" (*De Trin.* II, 2, 2 PL 10 51).

5. *Catech.* IV, 2 PG 33 456B.

6. "*Le Dieu-Homme mesure de tout*," in *Selected Works*. trans. from the Serbian by Jean-Louis Palierne, Paris, n.d., 51-105.

7. According to St Cyril of Alexandria, the union of God and man in Christ does not involve the alteration of either nature; it is far more than a moral union and more than "the assumption (προσλήψει) of one person only." "We say rather that the Word having united hypostatically to Himself flesh animated by a rational soul, inexplicably and incomprehensibly became man...We say that, although the natures differ which are united in a true unity, there is one Christ and Son from both. The differences of the natures are not destroyed through the union, but rather the Divinity and humanity formed for us one Lord Jesus Christ and one Son..." (*Ep. IV ad Nest.* PG 77 45C).

8. *Hom. Def. Jub. et Dogm.* 1, 23 PG 150 1240A, 1245D.

9. See P. Sherwood's Introduction to *The Ascetic Life and the Four Centuries of Charity* by St Maximos the Confessor (*Ancient Christian Writers* [vol. 21], Westminster [Md.], 1955, pp. 3-102.

10. *Mystagogia*, 2, 7, 24 PG 91 66C, 680D, 705B. St Maximos also discourses on the monodual nature of the Eucharist and the other Mysteries of the Church. See also the mystagogy of St Gregory the Great (Dialogos) in his second *Homily on Ezekiel*, St Germanos' *Mystagogia*, St Symeon, Archbishop of Thessalonica, *Dialogue in Christ Against all the Heresies* (chaps. 33-100); and the remarks of St Hilary of Poitiers in his ruminations on Psalm CXXIV.

11. Secularism is the antithesis of deification whose very purpose is the ontological transformation or transfiguration of created being. The latter is a process --- a "theanthropic" or "theandric process" which has begun already on earth in and through the Church --- a divine truth obfuscated in the philosophical theology of Augustine. The first moment of this "process" is Baptism --- κατὰ μέθεξιν δηλονότι τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος, ἐν ᾧ καὶ ἐσφραγίσθημεν εἰς ἡμέραν ἀπολυτρώσεως, πάντα ῥύπον

ἀπονιψάμενοι, καὶ ἀπάσης κηλίδος ἀπηλλαγμένοι (St Cyril of Alexandria, *In Isaiam* V, 1 PG 70 1144D).

The christological term "assumption" means nothing more than deification; thus, what has not been "assumed" by Christ is not saved, that is, deified. The grace by which we have been "assumed" is the uncreated Energy of God that the creature might "partake of the divine nature" (II Pet. 1:4). Created grace cannot deify. This is the universal teaching of the Fathers: St Irenaeos, *Adv. Haer.* V, pref. PG 7 1120; St Athanasios the Great, *De Incarn. Verbi*, 54 PG 25 192B; St Gregory of Nyssa, *Ora. Cat.* XXV PG 45 65D; St Gregory the Theologian, *Ep. CI Cled.* PG 37 184A; St Maximos the Confessor, *Ad Thal.*, 60 PG 90 921AB; St Hippolytos of Rome, *Ref. Omn. Haer.* X, 29-30 PG 16 3442C-3445A, etc; St Cyprian of Carthage, *Ep.* LVIII, 6 PL 3 364D; St Hilary of Poitiers, *De Trin.* II, 24; X, 4 PL 10 66B, 283B; St Leo the Great, *Serm.* XXV, 5; LXVI, 4; LXIII, 6 PL 54 211C, 367A, 357A; St Ambrose *De Sacr. Incarn. Dom.* IV, 23; VI, 5 PL 16 859B, 867C; St Peter Chrysologos, *Serm.* LXVII PL 52 891AB, etc.; and even Tertullian, *Adv. Marcion* II, 27; among the Syrians, Patriarch Timothy I --- *Incarnationem Verbi, deificationem humanitatis (Corpus Script. Christ. Orient.* [vol 31], Louvain, 1953, 73:1).

I am astonished by the ignorance of R.V. Sellers: "The conception of man's salvation amounting to his deification could not thrive on Western soil, and it is only because of contact with Eastern ideas that it appears in Sts Hilary and Leo" (*The Council of Chalcedon*, London, 1953, p. 184). As a matter of fact, it is with the dominance of the Augustinian mentality that salvation as deification recedes as a prominent theme of Western theology. Nevertheless, the idea persisted through the Latin Middle Ages and into the Protestant Reformation (See C. Dumont, *"Katholiken und Orthodoxie...,"* 116f).

12. This is the vocabulary of Fr Justin Popovich. It is based on the language of the Ecumenical Councils, for example, "theandrism" (θεάνδρος) and "theanthropy" (θεάνθρωπος). He writes, if I do not misread him, that the Fathers, consciously or not, composed their treatises and sermons with christological presuppositions (See *"Le Dieu-Homme Mesure de tout,"* in *Selected Works*, 51-67).

13. *De Gen. ad litt.* I, iv, 9 PL 34 249. Origen's *In Genesim Homiliae* opens with the words, "'In the beginning God made the heavens and the earth'... What is 'beginning' of all things except our Lord and Saviour of all, Jesus Christ? In this 'beginning' 'all things were made.' Scripture is not speaking here of any temporal beginning, but says that the heavens and the earth and all things were made 'in the beginning,' that is, the Saviour" (*Fathers of the Church* [vol. 71]. trans. by R.E. Heine. Washington DC, 1982, p. 47). Not unlike the commentaries of Origen and Victorinus, Augustine's "literal" exegesis was in fact very allegorical (See the J.H. Taylor's *Introduction to his translation of St Augustine: The Literal Meaning of Genesis*, in *Ancient Christian Writers* (vol. 40). New York, 1982, p. 9). Christian theology does not equate the Logos with Neo-Platonic "Beginning." Augustine cannot appeal to Proverbs 8:22. This verse refers either to the participation of the Logos in the creation (St Theophilos of Antioch); His "utterance" by the Father at the moment of creation (St Justin Martyr); and/or to Christ as the new economy (St Athanasios).

14. Augustine did not begin to use the body-soul analogy in his christology until 402 (*Serm.* CCXXXVII, 11 2 PL 38 1123). The remarks of W. Mallard on this matter are pertinent. He notes that as late as 386 Augustine held a Photinian view of Christ (cf. *Conf.* VII, 19). Although later moderated, the idea of "a certain separateness between the Logos and the human being [of Christ] persisted." Moreover, his inclination was always to identify Christ with the *Nous* of Plotinos ("The Incarnation in Augustine's Conversion," *Recherches Augustiniennes* XV [1980], 91, 97). Adolf von Harnack contends that Augustine's christology "at all times retained a strong affinity for that of Paul of Samosata and Photinos...because he knew that his faith could not dispense with the man Jesus, he (Augustine) supported the psuedo-speculation that the Word had become the content of Christ's soul" (*History of Dogma* [vol. 5], p. 30, n.2).

15. "The Influence of Theodore of Mopsuestia on Augustine's Letter 187," *Augustinian Studies*, 116.

16. *O si cognovisses Dei gratiam per Jesum Christum Dominum nostrum ipsamque incarnationem qua hominus anima corpusque suscepit...* (*De Civ. Dei* X, xxix, i PL 41 308). Theodore of Mopsuestia was well known and highly esteemed in the West for his opposition to the Macedonians. Augustine may have read him as early as 415. Although the two bishops disagreed on the role of Christ's human will (and, to be sure, man's will in his salvation), "they were in full agreement on the importance and the unique quality on the grace given to Christ," writes McWilliam-Dewart, "and they rose to the same note: 'that singular grace' (*singularis gratia*): O grace which is above all and was given to Jesus! O grace which overcomes all nature! --- *O gratia quae super omnia data est Jesu! O gratia superavit omnium naturam!* (*Ench.* IX, 36 PL 40 250)." In other terms, Augustine conceived the Incarnation as "a union of grace, i.e., the union was, on the part of God, an intense and unique presence; and, on the side of man, a belonging to the person of the Word through free will sustained by grace" ("The Influence of Theodore of Mopsuestia...," 131). Cf. Augustine, *Gen. ad Litt.* XX, vii, 17 459 where he contrasts the "shadowy presence" of God in the Old Testament and His "bodily presence" in the New.

17. Augustine wrote to Laurentius that "in the arrangement by which Christ was born of the Holy Spirit, not as His Son and not as the Virgin Mary's Son, but as a manifestation of God's [created] grace. For it was by this grace that a man without previous merit was at the moment of His existence as a man, so united in one person with the Word of God that He was both Son of God and Son of Man. Thus, He took on human nature, the mode of grace in Him precluding any possibility of sin" (*Ench.* I, 40 252). See R.A. Greer, "The Analogy of Grace in Theodore of Mopsuestia's Christology," *The Journal of Theological Studies* XXXIV, 1 (1983), 82-98.

18. *Verumtamen duarum rerum incorporearum commixtio facilius credi debuit, quam unius incorporeae, et alterius corporeae* (*Ep.* XXXVI, 11 PL 33 520).

19. *Christ in Christian Tradition*, p. 325.

20. The idea that *Verbum particeps carnis effectum est rationalis anima mediante* (*Ep. CXL ad Hon.* IV, 12 PL 33 542) may have been suggested to him by Origen or Rufinus.

21. *...quibus intervenientibus habit maiestas Verbi ab homini fragilitate secretius* (*De Fid. et Symb.*, IV, 10 PL 40 187). One may wonder how the body may "contaminate" the soul if there is no direct contact between them.

22. *Quapropter cum Filius sit et Deus* et *homo, alia substia homo potius in Filio quam Filius in Patre; sicut caro animae meae, alia substantia est ad animam meam, quamvis in uno homine, quam anima alterius hominis ad animam meam* (*De Trin.* I, x 20 834-835).

23. *"Wohl aber gilt er und zwar in strengen Sinne --- von der Person des Gottmenchen, die keine andere ist als de Person des Ewigen Wortes und Sohnes des Vaters. Das konkrete Mench-sein der homo in Christus, ist kein anderer als Gott-Sohn selbst in Person, waehrend der Sohn nicht person-identisch ist mit dem Vater, vielmehr ihm als verschiedende Person gegenuebersteht"* (Ternus, J., "Das Seelen-und Berwussteseinleben Jesus," in *Das Konzil von Chalkedon* [bd. 3], 209- 210). See also the discussion in Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian Tradition*, pp. 319-328.

24. See Professor Albert Oulter's *Introduction to Augustine's Confessions and Enchirdion*, volume three of *The Library of Christian Classics*, Philadelphia, 1955, p. 13.

25. *Ep.* XLVIII, 5 PL 16 1202C.

26. *De Sac. Incarn. Dom.* IV, 23 PL 16 860A.

27. *De Fid.* VII, 46 PL 16 623D-624A.

28. R.V. Sellers, *The Council of Chalcedon*, p. 229.

29. Mansi (vol. VIII), 116f.

30. *Serm.* XXI, 2 PL 54 192B.

31. *Ep. ad Jul.* XXXV, 3 PL 54 809A.

32. *...quia catholica ecclesia hac fide vivit, hac proficit, ut nec sine vera divinitate humanitas nec sine vera credatur humnitate divinitas* (Mansi, *loc. cit.*).

33. See Sellers discussion of Pope St Leo's christology, in *The Council of Chalcedon*, pp. 228-253.

34. We have reason to believe that St Leo read various treatises and letters of Augustine, perhaps put into the papal library by Prosper of Aquitaine, his secretary. We do not know what he might have learned from those writings, but it is certain that he did not acquire Augustine's rationalism.

35. *...ut quod Christum et Ecclesiam unam personam, hoc etisam unius personae actibus significari videamus... Sancta enim ecclesia duas vitas habet, unam quam temporaliter ducit, unam aliam quam aeternam recipit; unam laborat in terra, aliam qua reumneratur in caelo...in sancta habeat Ecclesia habeat interioria sua, illa videlicet vitam quae adhuc ocuis nostra, oculta est. Habeat extra earm atrium exterius...;* and the Eucharist is *sacrificio carnis offeruntur...in aludem Dei gloria resurrectionis...offeretur caro quando in aeterna incorruptione permuta nil contradictionis* (*Hom. in Ezek.* II, x, 4 PL 76 1060B).

36. The Jesuit, Emile Mersch, endorses Augustine's ecclesiology, but not without question. The Bishop of Hippo "makes it quite clear that the very fact of the Incarnation renders Christ the Head of Christians," Mersch writes. "But he fails to take the final step; he does not say how and why the hypostatic union endows the Saviour's humanity with such supreme perfection..." (*The Whole Christ: The Historical Development of the Doctrine of the Mystical Body in Scripture and Holy Tradition*, trans. by J.R. Kelly, London, 1956, p. 409). Augustine could not "say how and why" the Incarnation "endows" the humanity of Christ with "supreme perfection" any more than he

can "say how and why" the individual Christian shares in that "perfection." He shrank from connecting spirit and matter and would not allow that human effort produces the "perfection" of the struggler. In any case, the whole idea of "perfection" seems almost inconsequential before the awesome fact of divine predestination.

37. To illustrate: "He prays for us as our Priest; He prays in us as our Head; He is petitioned as our God. Let us therefore hear both our words in Him and His words in us...We pray to Him in the form of God; He prays in us in the form of a servant. There He is the Creator; here He is the creature. He changes not, but takes the creature and transforms it into Himself, making us one man, head and body, with Himself. We pray therefore to Him, through Him and in Him. We pray with Him; and He with us; we recite His prayer of the Psalm in Him, and He recites it in us" (*Enn. in Psal.* LXXXV PL 37 1081). His sermons are moving and sincere, but one is always left with the feeling, recalling all else Augustine has said about the relationship between God and man, that their union is never consummated.

38. As we shall see, Augustine's teaching that only "the few," "the elect," "the predestined to glory" receive "efficacious" or "saving grace" necessarily effects his soteriology and ecclesiology. His entire system is enervated by, albeit consistent with, his christological dualism.

39. *Augustine*, Oxford, 1986, p. 55.

40. *The History of Dogma* (vol. 5), p. 166. St Hilarion adds something more. If we believe Augustine, he states, "the Church is a concept narrower than Christianity." With this view, it is possible to be in accord with the Church while remaining outside her (hence, the "validity of heretical Sacraments"). Although demanding unity with the Church and the will's accord (*consensio volentatem*) with her as indispensable for salvation (*De Bapt. c. Donat.* IV, xii, 17-24 PL 43 170), Augustine's conception of the Sacraments proves that he understood that "concord of will" as an "abstract thesis." In truth, Archbishop

Hilarion concludes, the Sacraments are the instruments of salvation and there are no Sacraments beyond her visible precincts even as "there is no salvation outside the Church" (*Christianity or the Church*, p. 25).

41. *De Bapt. c. Donat.* V, xxviii, 39 196. Augustine was able to hold such a position because he did not equate the visible Church with the Church herself, an unavoidable consequence of his philosophical and christological dualism.

42. *Ench.*,I, 62 261.

43. On the Augustinian roots of Luther's theory of "double predestination," see F. Broche, *Luther on Predestination*, Uppsala, 1978.

44. *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, IV, 1:3. Calvin, Luther and the Protestant Reform generally recognized a "Church" within the Church. Luther insisted that "the true Church" is known to God alone. Calvin maintained that a person can prove his membership and election in "the true Church" by good works, as the fruit of faith in Christ. Nevertheless, it was probably Luther who brought once more to popular cognizance the presence of the *ecclesia spiritualis* within the historical Church.

Luther "began exactly where, more than a thousand years before his time, the question regarding the Church of the New Testament had been stirred up again and again and never answered by Augustine. Augustine had conceived the Church as the communion of the Spirit, created solely by God, Who bestows faith and elects for Himself the citizens of His realm. But side by side with this view we find that Augustine was also convinced that the Catholic Church, visible and tangible, with her bishops, sacraments and dogma, was the only saving Church. Augustine never reconciled these two views concerning the Church. Luther clearly perceives the contradiction. Only for a few years did he endure the vagueness and half measures of Augustine... The Church...no longer finds its unity in the Catholic succession of bishops (*successio episcoporum*), but in the hidden and uninterrupted continuity of believers (*successio fidelium*)..." (H. Bornkamp, *Luther's World of Thought*, trans. by M.H. Bertram. St Louis, Mo., 1958, p. 143). Because he denied the visibility of the Church, the Body of Christ, Luther implicitly rejected the Incarnation.

45. See B.B. Warfield, *Calvin and Augustine*, pp. 290f., 322f., 307-312; J. Mackinnon, *Luther and the Reformation* (vol. 1), London, 1925, pp. 54-66, 122-139, 154-162; E.G. Schweibert, *Luther and His Times*, St Louis, 1950, pp. 158-162; E. Wolf, *Peregrinatio: Studien zur reformatorischen Theologie und zum Kirchen problem*, Muenchen, 1962; and R.H. Bainton, *Studies on the Reformation*, Boston, 1963.

46. St Dionysios the Areopagite, *Eccl. Hier.* I, 1 PG 3 372A.

47. St Paul proclaimed "great is the mystery of piety" --- μέγα ἐστι τὸ τῆς εὐσεβείας μυστήριον (I Tim. 3:16) and referred to the Church as "the great mystery" --- τὸ μυστήριον τοῦτο μέγα ἐστίν (Eph. 5:23). "We call all things concerning Christ 'the mystery of piety' (εὐσεβείας μυστήριον), which do not bear directly on the 'preaching' (κηρυγμα) of the Gospel," said the Ps.-Chrysostom (*Incarn. Dom.* PG 59 687). The Cross is a "mystery" (Both/Now of the Ideomelon for Good Friday Vespers); and, of course, the Resurrection of the Lord is a "mystery" as the fulfillment of the past and the anticipation of the future, for which reason Sunday, the Lord's Day (κυριακή), is "the mystery of the Eighth Day" --- *sacramentum ogdoadis* (St Hilary of Poitiers). The mystagogical rites are suprarational, "theophanies" or "epiphanies," "incarnations," if you like, of the eternal in time (See the provocative essay by Fr Alexander Schmemann, "Sacrament: An Orthodox Presentation," *Oecumenica Jahrbuch fuer oekumenische Forschung*, Minneapolis, 1970, 94-107).

In the words of H. Rahner, "'Mystery' was the word used to describe the great redeeming drama of God's salvation, and particularly --- for it is part of the drama --- the unfolding of the story of that salvation in the OT --- a single great parable, the last of which finds its meaning and consummation in Christ. It was used to describe the Church, and, with the Church, her sacraments, and the truths contained in the Creeds, the

formulations of the faith. All these things were called "mysteries," because they are deeds, rites and words which proceed from the unfathomable riches of God's resolve..." (*Greek Myths and Christian Mystery*, trans. by B. Battershaw, New York, 1963, p. 31).

"Mysteries" as "miracles," as theophanies, are not *signs* of grace --- *a fortiori* not created grace --- but, contrary to Augustine, they are "manifestations of His glory" --- καὶ ἐφανέρωσε τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ (St John Chrysostom, *In Joan.*, XXIII, 2 PG 59 139). Thus, Augustine was wrong to think that the changing of the water to wine at the Wedding of Cana (Jn. 2:1-12) was no different from rain falling from the clouds, save that the regularity of natural occurrences dulls our minds (8th tractate of *Tractus in Joannis Evangelium*).

48. See the remarks of M. Eliade in "Sacrament," *The Encyclopaedia of Religion* (vol. 12), ed. by M. Eliade, etc., New York, 1987, 508f.

49. J. Fitzer, "The Augustininan Roots of Calvin's Eucharistic Thought," *Augustinian Studies* VII (1976), 73. According to Augustine, the *sacrificium*, like all Sacraments, is *visibile invisibilis sacrificii sacramentum, id est sacrum signum est* (*De Civ. Dei* X, ii, 5 PL 41 282). "His definition of *sacramentum* in terms of *signum* has become classical," comments R.A. Markus ("St Augustine on Signs," in *Augustine: A Collection of Critical Essays*, ed. by R.A. Markus, Garden City [NY], 1972, p. 61). Markus (*op. cit.*, p. 65) believes that Origen is the source of Augustine's definition of signs --- *Signum namque dicitur, cum per hoc quod videtur aliud aliquid indicatur: sicut cum, verbi gratia, dicit Dominus in Evangelios: 'Generatio haec signum quaerit: et signum non dabitur ei, nisi signum Jonae prophetae...'* (*Comm. in Rom.* IV, 2 PG 14 968). Concerning the "validity" of the Sacraments on the basis of ther right formula or "word," see *De Bapt. c. Dona.* III, 15-20. Regarding "types" and "rites" as "signs," see chapters 2-4 in *De Doctrina Christiana;* and *Contra Faust.* XIX, 13-14 (and footnote, 53). Augustine's conception of the Sacraments involves not only a theory of signs but his entire epistemology.

50. *Augustine the Bishop*, p. 304.

51. *Ench.* VI, 15 258.

52. St Hilarion states that there is "a sufficient quantity of historical material" to show that "Augustine's arguments" are found "nowhere" in Christian antiquity, especially his imaginative theory concerning "the validity of heretical baptism" (*The Unity of the Church...*, p. 31).

53. For Augustine miracles are "signs" as the Sacraments are "signs" (R.A. Markus, p. 61). Augustine developed a hierarchy of "signs" (e.g., the liturgical "kiss of peace" is a "sign of unity"; but common prayer is also a "sign of unity," albeit greater; and the Eucharist is likewise a "sign of unity" but greater than common prayer, etc.). See J. Engels, "*La doctrine du signe chez Saint Augustine*," in *Studia Patristica* (vol. IV, 4), ed. by F.L. Cross. Berlin, 1962, 366-373; and Augustine's Sermon 227.

54. *Tract. in Ioan.* LXXX, 3 PL 35 1810.

55. *De Bapt. c. Donat.* III, xi, 1, 16 - xiii, 18 PL 43 145.

56. St Basil wrote that "those who secede from the Church have not the grace of the Holy Spirit and the power thereof has ceased with their departure ...having become laymen with no authority to baptize or ordain anyone and, therefore, not able to impart to others the grace of the Spirit which they have forfeited..." Also, Baptism in the Name of the Trinity is futile, unless "baptized in the Names that have been handed down in the context of traditional teaching" (Canon, I).

57. *The Unity of the Church...*, p. 29.

58. *De Bapt. C. Donat.* V, vi, 7 181.

59. *The Unity of the Church...*, p. 30.

60. *Op.cit.*, p. 31.

61. *De Bapt. c. Donat.* I, ii, 3 110. Compare the words of St Cyprian of Carthage on "heretical baptism": "For when we say, 'Do you believe in eternal life and remissions of sins not granted except through the holy Church?' we mean that among heretics where there is no Church, sins are not put away. Therefore they who assert that heretics baptize must either change the interrogation or maintain the truth --- unless, of course, they believe heretics have a Church and, therefore, have baptism" (*Ep. LXIX ad Jan.*, 2); and the 7th Council of Carthage (258). Cf. Tertullian, *De Bapt.*, 15 PL 1 1324C-1325A. Both St Cyprian and Tertullian understand the Sacrament in wholly ecclesiological terms: heretics have no Sacraments because they have no Church. Augustine argues that heretics have Sacraments because they employ the right words and signs.

62. I am surprised that Augustine would claim *per quos postea plenarii concilii autoritate originalis consuetudo firmata est* (*De Bapt. c. Donat.* VI, i, 1 197). Where or with whom did this custom originate? He does not say. Which "plenary council," East or West, confirmed it? Augustine does not tell us.

63. The notion that heretics confer "the real and true Sacrament" --- *quamvis ipsum et verum dent Baptismi sacramentum* (*De Bapt. c. Donat.* III, x, 13 144) --- outside the Church is not only contradictory but has theological implications about which Augustine seemed unaware or unconcerned. He took this revolutionary position in opposition to Donatist exclusivism. The result, however, was to overthrow not their arguments, but the traditional concept of "mystery." All the Mysteries are but aspects of "the great *mysterion*," the Church; hence, a "heretical Sacrament" is "economic" nonsense.

64. *Tract. in Ionn.* XXVI, 11 1611.

65. *Ep. XCVIII ad Bonif.*, 9 PL 33 364.

66. *Tract. in Ionn.* XXVI, 19 1615.

67. Portalié, *A Guide...*, p. 258. Several things are worthy of note. The exclamation of the Lord, "Verily, verily, I say unto to you, Except you eat (φάγητε) the flesh of the Son of Man and drink His Blood..."; and "Whosoever eats (τρώγων) my Flesh..." (John 6:53-54) were quoted on more than one occasion by Augustine. We observe that Messiah, in the same discourse, in two successive sentences, switches from the word φαγητε ("you eat") to the stronger τρώγων ("crushing or grinding between the teeth"). Augustine seemed not to have noticed the change; nevertheless, no Father of the Church teaches that on the paten and in the chalice are the physical Flesh and Blood of Christ, for, as some of the Fathers explain, the idea of eating and drinking flesh and blood is repugnant to human nature (*Paradise of the Fathers*, trans. by E.A. Wallis-Budge, Seattle [n.d.], II, 22). The Eucharist is "the mystical Supper," because, as St John of Damascus affirms, it is not a "figure" but "the deified Body and Blood of the Lord Himself." He makes no attempt to explain the change from mere bread and wine to the "mystical Supper" (*De Fid. Orth.* IV, 13 PG 94 1152A).

68. *Tract. in Ionn.* XXVI, 15 1614.

69. *De sacra.* VI, 1, 1 PL 16 453C.

70. *Op. cit.*, IV, 1, 4 475A.

71. *De Myst.*, 53 PL 16 424.

72. I refer to "the unchangeable Forms in the Word of God...the things that He produces from these works even now (i.e., the *rationes seminales*)" to which Augustine added, "God's work from which He rested on the seventh day" (*De Gen. ad litt. imperf.* V, xii, 28 331). There is also the *analogia entis*, the hierarchy of beings, and his peculiar exegesis of "night" and "day" in Gen. 1 as "unformed creation" and "formed creation" (*op.cit.*, I, xvii, 35 333-334) which necessarily involves the *rationes seminales*. Time, then, is the state of becoming, of change, of the transient and of the illusory.

73. *De Trin.* II, vi, 11 853. Again, the operative word "sign" (*signum*). In the same place, Augustine maintained that the Holy Spirit "is also said to be sent on account of these corporeal forms which came into existence for a time to signify (*significandum*) and demonstrate His presence in a manner congenial to the human senses" (*ibid.*, II, vii, 2 853).

74. Romanides, "The Filioque," 308f.

75. Fr Ranson asserts that Augustine developed his extraordinary theory of the Old and New Testament "theophanies" during his dispute with the Arians (*Le Lourd Sommeil Dogmatique de l'Occident*, 34).

76. *De Trin.* II, v, 10 PL 42 851.

77. The angels are already privileged to look upon God. They "behold the immutable essence of the Creator with such clarity," Augustine announced, "that because of this vision and the love it inspires, they prefer the vision of His essence to all else" (*De Gen. litt. imperf.* XII, xxxvi, 69 484.

78. Romanides, "Highlights of the Debate over Theodore of Mopsuestia's Christology...," 181.

79. See Vladimir Lossky's *The Vision of God*, trans. by A. Moorhouse, Clayton [Wisc.], 1963.

Conclusion

May we call Augustine, the Bishop of Hippo, a Saint and Father of the Orthodox Church? Shall we call him outlaw? For the West, since the age of King Charlemagne, it never occurred to anyone to ask the question. Virtually every medieval and Reform theologian wrapped himself in the mantle of Augustine's authority. There is not a single modern philosopher --- indeed, the entire modern philosophical adventure itself --- who is not indebted to him in some way. There could not have been a Carolingian Renaissance, Scholaticism, Reformation and no secular modernity --- often a reaction to Augustinian historiosophy and ethics[1] --- without him.

Augustine is likewise the origin, whatever modifications have been made through the centuries, of almost every religious opinion which separates Western Christendom from the Orthodox Church --- philosophical or cataphatic theology, *filioque*, eternal Ideas, predestination, created and irresistible grace (monergism), the immateriality of the soul, Idealistic epistemology, mystagogical legalism, "nestorian" or dualistic christology and ecclesiology; purgatory, *visio beata* and, above all, Hellenism, the invisible hand behind Augustine's innovations.

Those innovations were opposed *ab initio* by many of the West Roman Fathers (St John Cassian, St Vincent of Lerins, St Gennadius of Marseilles, St Lupus of Troyes, St Faustus of Riez, etc.). Many others were ignorant of his doctrine or, perhaps, simply ignored it (Sts Paulinus, Valerian, Peter of Ravenna, etc.). The hagiographers among them (e.g., Sts Gregory of Tours,

Gennadius of Marseilles and Jerome) show little evidence of having researched his life and works, if we may judge by the titles listed in their works.

With these facts alone, one should be able to dispel the fantasy that the Orthodox Church has never doubted Augustine's fidelity to the Apostolic Tradition, believing instead that his treatises, discourses and orations were adulterated, perhaps by the *Libri Carolini* or the Scholastics --- not so far-fetched had his writings not passed through so many critical editions. His champions, also, have ignored the abundance of literary evidence (e.g., the works of Prosper) which confirms the conventional understanding of Augustine. Moreover, it is fact that, in the history of Eastern Orthodoxy, not a single major figure had read, whether in Latin or in translation, the principal works (excepting *De Trinitate*) of Augustine.

Any defense of Augustine's sanctity, from an Orthodox perspective, can only be the result of an erroneous study of church history and, perhaps, a false sense of piety. In modern times, it is St Nikodemos of the Holy Mountain who gave impetus to the movement among the Orthodox to elevate Augustine to the status of Church Father. Ostensibly, Nikodemos inferred the doctrinal fidelity of Augustine from the mention of his name at the 4th and 5th Ecumenical Councils. His works may have been quoted by several of the *confrères*, but the evidence is not incontestable when one considers that so much of the original documentation has been lost and may have been doctored.

Moreover, if his name was part of the conciliar debates, we may not justifiably conclude his sanctity from this happenstance. For example, St Gregory the Wonderworker wrote a *Panegyric to Origen* and Sts Basil

the Great and Gregory the Theologian included some of his orations in the *Philokalia*, but the Church has not put the Alexandrian on her calendar nor composed a troparion in his honor. Augustine is the beneficiary of holy men who, for the best of reasons, failed or were unable to examine with care his doctrine and church history.

One must recall, too, the words of St Maximos the Confessor that "Truth judges Councils." In the case of Augustine, it appears that his christological opinions, after playing a minor role in them, were excised from the "consciousness" of the Church. It is a curious fact that the name of Augustine is heard no more in councils of the Church after Trullo, surfacing on the cultural scene only during those times of intense Western influence. He has always been part of the post-Byzantine "pseudomorphicization of Orthodoxy."[2]

Therefore, we must agree, at least partly, with "the Athenian lawyer" of the Mantzouneas memorandum that Augustine is no Father of the Orthodox Church. The Church of Greece *cum sui* was hasty in putting him on the ecclesiastical calendar. Surely, his lamentable list of "theological" and "economic" errors is too long and too serious for us to place him on the patristic roll. He did not share the *phronema* of the Fathers, even those who, it may be argued, may have erred in some way.

No one denies Augustine's "astonishing contributions to the defense of Orthodoxy,"[3] but that no more entitles him to the honor of "saint and doctor" than Didymos the Blind or Tertullian, who greatly enriched the theological and ascetical language of the Church. Like the errors of these ecclesiastical writers, the errors of Augustine were the consequence

of his peculiar "mind-set." It is wasteful, if not dangerous, to do for Augustine what Fr Mantzouneas and those like him have tried to do, that is, to construct an artifical defense for him. *Tradition has spoken: Augustine is neither a Saint nor a Father of the Orthodox Church. He must be classified with Tatian, Clement and Origen, Arios, Lanctantius, Commodianus, Diodoros of Tarsos, Theodore of Mopsuestia, Nestorios, Eutyches, Severus of Antioch, etc.*

The indictment reads not that he deliberately and consciously sought to pervert the teachings of Christianity --- neither would have Valentinian or Photinos, etc. made such an admission --- but rather that Augustine imagined himself divinely commissioned to extend, if not reinterpret Christianity, as it had been hithero understood. Thus, his polemics against the Manicheans, the Academics, the Donatists, the Pelagians and the Arians, although clearly effective, employed arguments which, concocted for the occasion, gradually altered the character of his personal faith. With every controversy, he abandoned his earlier and largely Orthodox opinions; thus, by the last decade of his life, Augustine had fashioned a Christianity perfectly consistent with his own prejudices and needs.

Hellenism, the instrumentality with which he sought to achieve his purposes --- the elevation of "faith" to rational knowledge, --- proved to be his undoing. He yielded to the same temptation by which Origen and other heretics were seduced.[4] Augustine fell prey to the lure of Platonism, both a good friend to Christians and a deadly enemy. He was not cautioned by the folly of Origen who, if we may believe Augustine's correspondence with St Jerome, the Bishop of Hippo respected despite his mistakes. Augustine did

not learn from Origen and many others the pitfalls of pagan philosophy and the folly of synthesis.

If Augustine is a heretic, if he succumbed to the charms of Hellenism, why then was he not formally condemned by the Orthodox Church? Who has brought this charge against him? In part, these objections have already been answered, but let me add that if he and his theological novelties were not directly and publicly execrated, time and circumstance worked in his favor, especially in the East where very little was known of his doctrine; and where, on account of the unavailability of literary sources and the condition of Byzantine and post-Byzantine education and, to be sure, any number of hasty assumptions based on favorable hearsay evidence, his memory settled quietly into a comfortable corner of her memory.

Curiously, Augustine knew more about "the Greeks" than they knew about him, since he quoted them and invoked their authority; but his writings are nowhere cited in the patristic literature of the East. The Orthodox there knew very little about his theology and almost nothing about the man. For example, St Photios learned the details of his triadology from the Franks. How strange, too, because it was the Franks who initially questioned the doctrinal innovations of Augustine, errors which might have been nipped in the bud if the early synods of Gaul had understood him.

Aside from the lobbying of his disciples, a not uncommon ignorance of Augustinianism (e.g., the Synod of Arles condemned a certain Lucidus as the author of predestinationism), in part, explained by the loss or suppression of important manuscripts --- mayhaps, the papal desire for peace --- sheltered the West from the truth. By the 9th century, Augustine was ready to

become intellectual *magister* of the occident. The paucity of knowledge concerning Greek Fathers was by then of little consequence to the new breed of theologians.[5]

In East Rome, Augustine was, in the years before the Crusades, an obscure Latin Orthodox theologian. He was mentioned in no menologion. He will not be translated into Greek until the 13th century. He will later become a source of consternation to St Mark of Ephesos. He will beguile the youthful George Kourteses (St Gennadios II) on account of his admiration for Thomas Aquinas who called the Bishop of Hippo teacher. Augustine will be a "humanist" to Bessarion, Pletho and Nicephoras Gregorias. Interest in Augustine will reach its zenith during the 17th and 18th centuries when many Greeks attended German, English and Italian schools; and in the 19th century, when modern ideologies will invade the East. Augustine will impact Russian and Slavic culture under the auspices of "the St Petersburg Revolution."[6]

But these centuries also represented the time of Orthodox reaction to Western theological expeditions. Augustinianism was implicitly rejected with all "Western innovations" by the Synods of Constantinople (1638), Jassy (1642) and Jerusalem (1672).[7] Augustine was not condemned by name, but, intentionally or not, fell under their anathemata. How could Augustine have failed to have been repudiated along with the other heterodox of the West, since they would not be what they were without him? The fathers of these synods rejected Augustine implicitly, that is, in their disapprobation of all "Western innovations," not the least of which was the rationalism which these errors presupposed --- the Augustinian legacy.[8]

In any case, it is enough that, historically, Augustine has no cultus in the Orthodoxy. If nothing else, he has been condemned by indifference. Over the last hundred years, for reasons far too complex to discuss here, some members of "the Eastern Church" have sought to rescue him from the historical Orthodox insouciance. More recent fervor for his rehabilitation has been fired by the so-called Ecumenical Movement. In truth, ecumenism will not be served by such efforts. The West must return to the Fathers.

FOOTNOTES TO THE CONCLUSION

1. See the Introduction to *The Philosophy of History in our Time: An Anthology*, ed. by H. Meyerhoff, pp. 2-9.

2. The late Orthodox historian and theologian, Fr George Florovsky observed that over the centuries Orthodoxy had been encrusted with an alien ("*pseudo*") form ("*morphe*"). Although the Faith of Church had not been changed, foreign influences imposed on Orthodoxy a strange idiom of discourse. Fr Florovsky describes it as "scholastic," i.e., legalist and rationalist (*Ways of Russian Theology* [part. I], trans. by P.L. Nichols, Belmont [Mass.], 1979, p. 85).

3. *Ibid.*, 14.

4. The Fathers commonly taught with Hippolytos that heresy "takes its starting-point from the wisdom of the Greeks, from the conclusions of those who have formed systems of philosophy." Heretics have availed themselves of "these pretentious theories, turning them to advantage by appropriating their principles; and impelled by them, have constructed doctrines of their own" (*Ref. Omn. Haer., I, proem.*).

5. The Carolingians had very little knowledge of the Greek Fathers. Their translations from the Greek were often made from faulty manuscripts which, for example, explains the poor translations of Sts Dionysios, Gregory the Theologian, Gregory of Nyssa and Ephiphanios by John Scotus Erigena. The only man in the West whose knowledge of Greek was comparable to Erigena's was Anastasius, the papal librarian. "Yet his numerous translation do not impress one with any peculiar excellence," writes M.L.W. Laistner (*Thought and Letters in Western Europe: A.D. 500 to 900*, Ithica, 1966, p. 248).

6. See the valuable discussion in G. Florovsky, *Ways of Russian Theology* (Pt. I), pp. 114-161; and Steven Runciman's *The Great Church in Captivity*, Cambridge [Eng.], 1985, pp. 165-288; G. Maloney, *A History of Orthodox Theology since 1453*, Belmont [Mass.], 1976, pp. 89-186; and T. Ware, *Eustratios Argenti*, Cambridge [Eng.], 1964.

7. Mesolora, I., *Symbolic Books of the Eastern Church* (vol. 2), Athens, 1893, 25-36 (in Greek). The Synod of Jerusalem under Patriarch Dositheos undertook to discuss ways to counter the Protestant menace in the East. The Patriarch hoped, also, to vindicate Cyril Loukaris, Patriarch of Constantinople, against the charge of Calvinism, the same Calvinism whose *sine qua non* is Augustinianism, the same Augustine whose works Dositheos believed to have been corrupted by an unknown hand. The Calvinist *Confession of Faith* attributed to Cyril breathes the spirit of Augustinianism. In a word, Dositheos was defending and attacking Augustine at the same time.

8. Augustine's dualism was to have ramifications for Western culture which he could not have forseen. In an edifying article, *"Le Conflit d'Augustin,"* Kurt Flasch writes: "*Augustin a égaré et tourmenté l'Europe. En même temps, il l'a aidée à trouver son identité dans le domain de la science et dans celui de la vie --- cela, en l'obligeant à renoncer à son penchant pour le surnaturel et à se reforger une identité propre grâce à un libere retour aux Anciens. Augustin a détruit l'idéal antique d'une homme raisonable, mâitre de lui-même, mais, en même temps, il lui a permis d'exercer une influence, il est vrai restreinte, sur le Moyen Age et les débuts de la modernité. Ses tendances dualistes ont, pour plusieurs siècles, rendu plu difficiles l'établissement d'une forme de unitaire et l'emploi cohérent de la raison. Il a détruit le concept philosophique antique de 'nature', mais il n'est pas arrivé pour autant à développer de façon cohérete la conception personnaliste que contenait sa théorie de l'esprit. Il a favorisé la répression de l'individuel dans la théorie et la praxis politique; mais, en même temps, c'est lui qui a rendu possible une nouvelle forme d'auto-évaluation pour les individus pensants: au niveau théorique, par le recours à sa doctrine de la formation de l'esprit à l'image de Dieu; au niveau des faits, par l'influence littéraire des Confessions qui ont donné une plus grande légitimité à l'intérêt pour la personne*

individuelle, y compris dans le sens de l'investigation biographique. Dans l'éthique politique, il a maintenu le souvenir de certaines normes de liberté fondées en droit naturel, mais, en même temps, il a expliqué que dans l'état présent, issu du péché originel, elles avaient perdu tout pouvoir..." (in *Augustin*. Paris, 1988, 40).

Bibliography

A. PRIMARY SOURCES:

Ancient Christian Writers (48 vols.), ed. by W.J. Burghardt & T.C. Lawler, New York, 1962-

Ante-Nicene Church Fathers (10 vols.), ed. by A. Roberts & J. Donaldson, Buffalo, 1887-1896.

Art of Prayer, trans. by E. Kadloubovsky & T. Ware, London, 1973.

Augustine, *The City of God*, trans. by M. Dods. New York, 1950

---- *Confessions*, trans. by E.B. Pusey, New York, 1950.

---- *Enchirdion: On Faith, Hope and Love*, trans. by H. Paolucci, Chicago, 1961.

Calvin, J., *Commentary on the Epistle of St Paul the Apostle to the Romans*, trans. & ed. by J. Owen, Grand Rapids, 1948.

---- *The Institutes of the Christian Religion* (2 vols.), trans. by F. Battles & ed. by J.T. McNeill, Philadelphia, 1960.

---- *A Treatise on the Predestination of God* (pt.1) and *The Providence of God* (pt. 2) in *Calvin's Calvinism*, trans. and ed. by H. Cole, Manchester, 1927.

Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum (89 vols.), Vienna, 1866-1986.

Documents Relatif au Orientalis (vols. 15, 17), ed. by R. Gaffin & F. Nau, Paris, 1920, 1923.

Fathers of the Church (75 vols.), ed. by T.P. Halton, etc. Washington DC, 1946-

Heufelder, E.M. ed., *The Way of God: According to St Benedict*, trans. by L. Eberle, Kalamazoo, 1983.

Luther, M., *Works* (54 vols.), trans. by E.W. Gritsch & ed. by J. Pelikan/H. Lehmann, Philadelphia/St Louis, 1958-1967.

Nicene Post-Nicene Fathers of the Church (15 vols.), ed. by P. Schaff, New York, 1887-1890 [first series]; P. Schaff & H. Wace, New York, 1895- 1899 [second series].

Paradise of the Fathers (2 vols.), trans. by E.A. Wallis-Budge, Seattle, n.d.

Patrologiae Cursus Completus: Series Graecae (162 vols.); *Series Latina* (217 vols.), ed. by J.P. Migne, Paris, 1857-1890.

Pelagius, *Expostion of Thirteen Epistles of St Paul*. Text & and Studies, ed. by A. Souter. Cambridge [Eng.], 1926.

Plato, *Works*, ed. by E. Hamilton & H. Cairns, Princeton, 1973.

Plotinos, *The Enneads*, trans. by S. Mackenna & B.S. Page, Chicago, 1952 (Great Books of the Western World, 17).

Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collecto (53 in 60 vols.), ed. by J.D. Mansi, Paris, 1901-1927.

St Cyril of Alexandria, *Selected Letters*. trans. & ed. by L.R. Wickham, Oxford, 1983.

St Gennadios II of Constantinople, *Oeuvres Compléte* (8 vols), ed. by L. Petit, X.A. Siderides, M. Jugie. Paris, 1928-1936.

St Germanos of Constantinople, *The Boundaries of Life*, trans.& ed. by C. Garton & L.G. Westernik, Buffalo, n.d. (Anthusa Monograph, 7).

St Gregory the Great, *Moralia, on Job*, in *A Library of the Fathers* (3 vols.), trans. by Members of the English Church, Oxford, 1897.

Sts Gregory of Nyssa/Macarios the Great, *Two Rediscovered Works of Ancient Literature*, ed. by

Werner Jaeger. Leiden, 1954.

St Gregory Palamas, *Défense de saints hesychasts* (2 vols.), Greek text with French translation by Fr J. Meyendorff, Louvain, 1959.

St Hilary of Poitiers, *Tractus Mysteriorum*, Latin with French translation by J.P. Brusson, Paris, 1947.

St Nikodemos Hagioretes, *A Handbook of Spiritual Counsel*, trans. by P.A. Chamberas & G.S. Bebis, New York, 1989

---- *Synaxaristes* (Sept.-Feb., t. I), Athens, 1868 (in Greek).

St Photios of Constantinople, *On The Mystagogy of the Holy Spirit*, trans. by Holy Transfiguration Monastery, New York, 1983.

Tychonius, *Book of Rules*, ed. by F.C.Burkitt, New York, 1894.

B. SECONDARY SOURCES

1. Books:

Alfaric, P., *L'Evolution intellectuelle de S. Augustin*, Paris, 1918.

Armstrong, A.H., ed., *The Cambridge History of Later Greek and Early Medieval Philosophy*, Cambridge [Eng.]., 1967.

Aulen, G., *Christus Victor: An Historical Study of Three Types of the Idea of the Atonement*, trans. by A.G. Herbert, New York, 1966.

Azkoul, M., *The Teachings Of the Holy Orthodox Church* (vol.1), Buena Vista [Col.], 1986.

Bainton, R.H., *Studies in the Reformation*, Boston, 1963

Benson, E.W., *Cyprian: His Life, His Times, His Work*, London, 1897.

Bonner, G., *St Augustine of Hippo: Life and Controversies*, Philadelphia, 1963.

Boyer, C., *Christianisme et Neoplatonisme dans la Formation de Saint Augustine*, Paris, 1920.

Bouyer, L., *The Spirituality of the New Testament and the Fathers* (vol. 1), trans. by M.R. Ryan, Paris, 1960.

Brightman, F.E., *Liturgies Eastern and Western*, Oxford, 1896.

Brown, R.L., *Augustine of Hippo*, Los Angeles, 1967.

Broché, F., *Luther on Predestination*, Uppsala, 1978.

Burghardt, W.J., *The Image of God in Man According to Cyril of Alexandria*, Washington [DC], 1957.

Carras, P.C., *Theological Aspects of the Council of Florence*, Brookline [Mass.], 1962.

Callahan, J.F., *Augustine and the Greek Philosophers*, Villanova [Pa.], 1967.

Cappuyns, M., *Jean Scot Eugène: sa Vie, Son Oeuvre, sa Pensée*, Louvain/Paris, 1933.

Chadwick, H., *Augustine*, Oxford, 1986.

Chadwick, O., *John Cassian: Study in Primitive Monasticism*, Cambridge [Eng.], 1986.

Chevalier, I., *St Augustin et la Pensée grecque: Les Relations Trinitaires*, Freibourg, 1940.

Cochrane, C.N., *Christianity and Classical Culture: A Study of Thought and Action from Augustus to Augustine*, New York, 1957.

Copelston, F., *A History of Philosophy* (vol. 2): *Medieval Philosophy* (pt. I): *Augustine to Bonaventure*, Garden City [NY], 1962.

Cross, F.L., ed., *Studia Patristica* (vols. 1-11), Berlin/Oxford, 1959 -1974; ed. by E.A. Livingston (vols.12-17), Oxford, 1975-1985. .

Danielou, J., *Origen*, trans. by W. Mitchell, New York, 1955.

---- *Platonisme et Théologie mystique: Essai sur la Doctrine spirituelle Grégoire de Nysse*, Paris, 1944.

D'Arcy, M.C., ed., *Saint Augustine: His Age, Life and Thought*, New York, 1957.

de Vogüé, A., *The Rule of Saint Benedict: A Doctrinal and Spiritual Commentary*, trans. by J.B.Hasbrouck, Kalamazoo, 1983.

Dudden, F.H., *Gregory the Great: His Place in History and Thought* (2 vols.), London, 1905.

---- *The Life and Times of St Ambrose* (2 vols.), Oxford, 1935.

Duckett, E.S., *Latin Writers of the Fifth Century*, New York, 1930.

Eible, H., *Augustine und die Patristik*, Muenchen, 1923.

Engelbrecht, A., *Studien ueber die Schriften des Bischops von Reii, Faustus*, Vienna, 1889.

Evans, R.F., *Pelagius: Inquiries and Reappraisals*, New York, 1918.

Florovsky, G., *Ways of Russian Theology* (pt. I), trans. by R.L. Nichols, Belmont [Mass.]. 1979.

Ferguson, J., *Pelagius: A Historical and Theological Study*, Cambridge [Eng.], 1956.

Garrigou-Lagrange, P., *Predestination*, trans. by R. Rose, St Louis, 1953.

Gerostergios, A., *Justinian the Great: The Emperor and Saint*, Belmont [Mass.], 1982.

Gibbon, E., *The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* (vol. 5), ed. by F.M. Milman, New York, 1886.

Gill, J., *The Council of Florence*, Cambridge [Eng.], 1959.

Gilson, E., *Being and Some Philosophers*, Toronto, 1957.

---- *The Christian Philosophy of St Augustine*, trans. by L.E.M. Lynch, New York, 1960.

---- *God and Philosophy*. New Haven [Conn.], 1944.

---- *The Spirit of Medieval Philosophy*, trans. by A.H.C. Downes, New York, 1940.

Grillmeier, A., *Christ in the Christian Tradition*, trans. by J.S. Bowden, New York, 1965.

---- & Bacht, H., *Das Konzil von Chalkedon: Geschichte und Gegenwart* (3 bds.), Wuerzbug, 1959-1961.

Hanson, R. & Crouzel, H., ed., *Origeniana Tertia: the International colloquium for Origen Studies*, Rome, 1981.

Haugh, R., *Photius and the Carolingians: The Trinitarian Controversies*, Belmont [Mass.], 1975.

Harnack, A., *The History of Dogma* (vol. 5), trans. by J. Millar, London, 1898.

Hefele, C.J., *A History of the Councils of the Church* (6 vols), trans. by W.R. Clarke, Edinburg, 1872-1896.

Henry, P., *Plotin et l'occident: Firmicus Maternal, Marius Victorinus, St Augustin et Macrobe*, Louvain, 1934.

Heufelder, E.M. ed, *The Way to God: According to the Rule of Saint Benedict*, trans. by L. Eberle; with trans. of *The Rule* by O.H. Blair, Kalamazoo, 1983.

Hillerbrand, A.J., ed., *The Protestant Reformation*, New York, 1968.

Javanka, E.V., *hrsg., Seit Neunhundret Jahren getrennte Christenheit*, Vienna, 1962.

Jaeger, W., *Early Christianity and the Greek Paideia*, Camrbidge [Mass.], 1961.

Labriolle, P. ed., *Histoire de l'Eglise* (vol. 4): *Mort de Theodose à l'election de Grégoire la Grand*, Paris, 1945.

Lampryllos, C., *La Mystification Fatale: Étude Orthodoxe sur le Filioque*, Lausanne, 1987.

Laistner, W.L.W., *Thought and Letters in Western Europe: 500-900*, Ithica [NY], 1966.

Lossky, V., *The Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church*, trans. by the Fellowship of St Alban & St Sergius, London, 1957.

---- *The Vision of God*, trans. by A. Moorhouse, Clayton [Wis.], 1963.

Madec, G., *Saint Ambroise et la Philosophie*, Paris, 1962.

Maloney, G.A., *A History of Orthodox Theology since 1453*, Belmont [Mass.], 1976.

Marrou, H.I., *Saint Augustine and His Influence Through the Ages*, trans. by P. Hepburne-Scott & E. Hill, New York, 1962.

---- *Saint Augustine et la fin de la culture antique*, Paris, 1938.

Mantzouneas, E., *The Question of the Sanctity of Holy Augustine*, trans. by C. Staede, St Louis, 1987.

Markus, R.A., ed., *Augustine: A Collection of Critical Essays*, Garden City [NY], 1972.

McKinnon, J., *Luther and the Reformation* (vol. 1), London, 1925.

Meletios (Archb.), *The Fifth Ecumenical Council*, Athens, 1985 (in Greek).

Mersch, E., *The Whole Christ: The Historical Development of the Mystical Body in Scripture and Tradition*, trans. by J.Kelly, London, 1956.

Mesolora, I., *Symbolic Books of the Eastern Orthodox Church* (vol. 2), Athens, 1893 (in Greek).

Meyerhof, H., ed., *The Philosophy of History in our Times: An Anthology*, Garden City [NY], 1957.

Meyendorff, J., *Introduction to the Study of Gregory Palamas*, trans. by T. Lawrence, London/New York, 1963.

Morris, L., *The Epistle to The Romans*. Grand Rapids, 1988

O'Connell, R.J., *St Augustine's Early Theory of Man, A.D. 386-391*, Cambridge [Mass.], 1968.

Pelikan, J., *The Christian Tradition: A History of the Development of Doctrine* (4 vols.), Chicago, 1971-1984.

Pohle, J. & Preuss, A., *The Sacraments* (2): *The Eucharist*, London, 1957.

Popovich, J., *Selected Works*. trans. by J.L. Palierene, Paris, n.d.

Portalié, E., *A Guide to the Thought of Saint*

Augustine, trans. by R.J. Bastian, Chicago, 1960.

Prat, F., *The Theology of St Paul* (2 vols.), trans. by J.L. Stoddard, Westminster [Md.], 1952.

Ranson, P., *Le Lourd sommeil Dogmatique de l'occident*, Paris, 1986.

---- ed., *Augustin*, Paris, 1988.

Reuter, H., *Augustinische Studien*, Aalen, 1967.

Seeberg, R., *Lehrbuch de Dogmengeschichte* (bd. 2), Leipzig, 1910.

Sellers, R.V., *The Council of Chalcedon: A Historical and Doctrinal Survey*, London, 1953.

Schaff, P., *A History of the Christian Church* (vol. 3), New York, 1891.

Schroers, H., *Hinkmar, Erzbischof von Reims*, Hildsheim, 1967.

Schuster, E., *Historical Notes on St Benedict's 'Rule for Monks'*, Hamden [Conn.], 1962.

Schweibert, E.G., *Luther and His Times*, St Louis, 1950.

Sherrard, P., *The Greek East and Latin West*, London, 1959.

Smits, S., *Augustine dans l'oeuvre de Jean Calvin* (2 vols.), Assen, 1957.

Souter, A., *A Study of Ambrosiaster*, New York, 1905.

Stauffer, E., *New Testament Theology*. trans. by J. Marsh. New York, 1955.

Straw, C., *Gregory the Great: Perfection in Imperfection*, Los Angeles, 1988.

Switalksi, B., *Plotinus and the Ethics of Augustine*, New York, 1961.

TeSelle, E., *Augustine the Theologian*, London, 1970.

Tixeront, J., *A Handbook of Patrology*, trans. by S.A. Raemers, St Louis, 1951.

---- *History of Dogmas (vol. 2): From St Athanasius to St Augustine (318-430)*, trans. by H.L.B. St Louis, 1914.

Tennant, F.R., *The Sources of the Doctrine of the Fall and of Original Sin*, New York, 1968.

Trigg, J.W., *Origen: The Bible and Philosophy in the Third Century*, Atlanta, 1973.

Troitsky, St Hilarion (Archb.), *Christianity or the Church?* trans. by L. Puhalo & V. Navokshanoff, Jordanville [NY], 1971.

---- *The Unity of the Church and the World Conference of Christian Communities*, trans. by M. Jerinec. Montreal, 1975.

Wallace-Hadrill, J.M., *The Frankish Church*, Oxford, 1983.

Ware, T. (Archb. Kallistos), *Eustratios Argenti: A Study of the Greek Church under Turkish Rule*, Oxford, 1964.

Warfield, B.B., *Calvin and Augustine*, Philadelphia, 1956.

Weigel, G., *Faustus of Riez: An Historical Introduction*, Philadelphia, 1938.

Whitley, W.T., ed., *The Doctrine of Grace*, New York, 1931.

Wiggens, G., *Versuch einer pragmatischen Darstellung des Augustinismus und Pelagianismus*, Berlin, 1821.

Williams, N.P., *The Grace of God*, London, 1930.

---- *The Ideas of the Fall and Original Sin*, London, 1927.

Wolf, E., *Peregrinatio: Studien zum reformatischen Theologie und zum Kirchenproblem*, Muenchen, 1962.

Van der Meer, F., *Augustine the Bishop: the Life and Work of a Father of the Church*, trans. by B. Baltershaw, London, 1961.

2. Articles:

Adam, A., *"Das Fortwirkendes des Manichaismus bei Augustinus," Zeitschrift fuer Kirchengeschichte* LXIX (1958), 1-25.

Altaner, B., *"Augustinus und die griechische Patristik," Revue Benedictine* LXX (1952), 201-205.

---- *"Augustinus und Irenaeus," Zeitschrift fuer katholische Theologie* XLV (1949), 162-172.

---- *"Augustinus und Origenes," Historisches Jahrbuch* LXX (1951), 15-41.

Armstrong, A.H., "St Augustine and the Eastern Tradition," *Eastern Churches Quarterly* V, 7 (1943), 157-167.

---- "Salvation: Plotinian and Christian," *The Downside Review* LXXXV (1957), 126-139.

Atwell, R.R., "From Augustine to Gregory the Great: An Evaluation of the Emergence of the Doctrine of Purgatory," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* XXXVI (1985), 84-96.

Azkoul, M., "The Greek Fathers: *Polis* and *Paideia*," *St Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* XXIII, 1 (1979),

3-21; 2 (1979), 67-86.

---- "*Peccatum Originales*: The Pelagian Controversy," *The Byzantine and Patristic Review* III, 1-2 (1984), 39-53.

Babock, W.S., "Augustine's Interpretation of Romans A.D. 394-396," *Augustinian Studies* X (1979), 55-74.

Barrois, G., "The Alleged Origenism of St Gregory of Nyssa," *St Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* XXX, 1 (1986), 7-16.

Bernard, R., *"La Predestination du Christ total selon Saint Augustin," Recherches augustiniennes* III (1965), 1-58.

Bonner, G., "Augustine's Conception of Deification," *The Journal of Theological Studies* XXXVII, 1-2 (1986), 369-386.

Boyer, C., *"John Calvin et Augustin," Augustinian Studies* III (1972), 15-34.

Brown, P., "The Patrons of Pelagius: The Roman Aristocracy Between East and West," *The Journal of Theological Studies* XXI (1972), 56-72.

Buonaiuti, E., "Manichaeism and Augustine's Idea of *'massa perditionis,'*" *The Harvard Theological Review* XX, 2 (1927), 42-127.

---- "The Genesis of Augustine's Idea of Original Sin," *The Harvard Theological Review* X, 2 (1917), 159-175.

Burleigh, J., "Doctrine of the Holy Spirit in the Latin Fathers," *Scottish Journal of Theology* VII (1954), 113-132.

Cabrol, F., *"Le Liber Testimonium de St Augustine et deux traité de Fauste de Riez," Revue des Questions Historique* XLVII (1890), 232-235.

Chadwick, H., "New Letters of St Augustine," *The Journal of Theological Studies* XXXIV 2 (1983), 425-452.

Chéné, J., *"Le Semipélagianisme du midi de la Gaul," Rechereches de Science Religeuse* XLIII (1935), 321-341.

---- *"Les origins de la contoverse Semipélagienne," Année Theologique augustinenne* XIII (1953), 56-109.

Diggs, B., "St Augustine Against the Academicians," *Traditio* VII (1949-1951), 73-93.

Dugmore, C.W., "Sacrament and Sacrifice in the Early Fathers," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* II (1951), 24-37.

Florovsky, G, "The Function of Tradition in the Ancient Church," *The Greek Orthodox Theological Review* IX, 2 (1963-1964), 181-200.

---- *"Westliche Einfluesse in der Russichen Theologie," Kyrios* II (1937), 1-22.

Frend, W.H.C., "The Gnostic Manichaean Tradition in Roman North Africa," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* IV (1953), 13-26.

Godet, P., *"Fauste de Riez," Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique* (t. 5), Paris, 1913, 2104-2105.

Grabowski, S.J., "The Holy Spirit in the Mystical Body of Christ According to St Augustine," *Theological Studies* VII, 1 (1946), 453-483.

---- "St Augustine and the Presence of God," *Theological Studies* XIII (1952), 336-358.

Greer, R.A., "The Analogy of Grace in Theodore of Mopsuestia," *The Journal of Theological Studies* XXXIV, 1 (1983), 1-23.

Hall, N., "Apostolic Succession," *Scottish Journal of*

Theology VII (1958), 113-133.

Henry, P., "Augustine and Plotinus," *The Journal of Theological Studies* XXXVIII (1937), 1-23.

---- "The *Adversus Arium* of Marius Victorinus: The First Systematic Exposition of the Trinity," *The Journal of Theological Studies* I (1950), 42-55.

Jugie, M., *"Georges Scholarios," Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique* (t. 14). Paris, 1941, 1522-1570.

---- *"St Augustin dans la littérature théologique de l'Eglise russe,"* ECHOS D'ORIENT XXXIII. 160 (1930), 385-395.

Krivosheine, B., "The Ascetic and theological Teaching of St Gregory Palamas," *The Eastern Churches Quarterly* IV (1938), 1-67 (reprint).

Lossky, V., "The Procession of the Holy Spirit in Orthodox Triadology," *The Eastern Churches Quarterly* VII, 2 (1948), 31-53.

Mallard, H., "The Incarnation in Augustine's Conversion," *Recherches Augustiniennes* XV (1980), 91-97.

McWilliam-Dewart, J., "The Influence of Theodore of Mopsuestia on Augustine's Letter 187," *Augustinian Studies* X (1979), 113-132.

Morris, J., "Pelagian Literature," *The Journal of Theological Studies* XVI (1965), 26-60.

Munz., P., "John Cassian," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* XLIII (1955), 321-341.

Newton, J., "The Importance of Augustine's Use of the Neoplatonic Doctrine of Hypostatic Union for the Development of Christology," *Augustinian Studies* II (1971), 1-16.

Pagels, E., "The Politics of Paradise: Augustine's

Exegesis of Genesis 1-3 versus that of John Chrysostom," *The Harvard Theological Review* LXXVIII, 1-2 (1985), 67-90.

Phipps, W.E., "The heresiarch: Pelagius or Augustine?" *Anglican Theological Review* LXI (1980), 124-133.

Refoulé, F., *"Julien d'Eclane Theologien et Philosophie," Recherche Science religieuse* LII (1964), 42-84; 233-247.

Portalié, R., *"St Augustin," Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique* (t. 1), Paris, 1909, 2268-2472.

Riga, R.J., "Created Grace in Augustine," "*Augustinian Studies* III (1972), 113-130.

Rist, J., "Augustine on Free Will and Predestination," *The Journal of Theological Studies* XX (1969), 420-447.

Romanides, J., "The Filioque," for *The Meeting of the Sub-Commission of Orthodox and Anglicans*. July 21-28, 1975 (Ref.no. AO/JOD 116).

---- "Highlights in the Debate over Theodore Mopsuestia's Christology and Some Suggestions for a Fresh Approach," *The Greek Orthodox Theological Review* IV, 2 (1959-1960), 140-185,

---- "Notes on the Palamite Controversy and Related Topics," *The Greek Orthodox Theological Review* VI, 2 (1960-1961), 186-205; IX, 2 (1965-1966), 225-270.

---- "Original Sin According to St Paul," *St Vladimir's Seminary Quarterly* IV, 2 (1955-1956), 5-28.

Rose, S., "The Place of Blessed Augustine in the Orthodox Church," *The Orthodox Word* LXXIX, 2 (1978), 67-86; LXXX (1987), 126-140.

Salaville, S., *"Une mention de Saint Augustin dans les dyptches de la liturgies St Jacques," L'Année Théologiques* XI (1950. 52-56.

Schmemann, A., "Sacrament: An Orthodox Perspective," *Oecumenica: Jahrbuch fuer oekumenische Forschung.* Minneapolis (1970), 94-107.

Schoenborn, C., "*Ueber die richtige Fassung des dogmatischen Begriffs der Vergoettlichung des Menschen," Freibruger Zeitschrift fuer Philosophie und Theologie* XXXIV, 1-2 (1987), 3-47.

Steinhauser, K.B., "Creation in the Image of God According to Augustine's *Confessions*," *The Patristic and Byzantine Review* VII, 2-3 (1988), 199-204.

Thorton, J., "St Augustine and His Enemies," *The Orthodox Path* I, 3 (Jan.-Feb.), 1-3.

Tsirpanlis, C.,N., "Cyril Loukaris' Vision of Unity and Relations with the West," *The Patristic and Byzantine Review* VII, 2 (1989), 85-100.

Weaver, D., "The Exegesis of Romans 5:12 Among the Greek Fathers and Its Implications for the Doctrine of Original Sin: the 5th - 12th Centuries," *St Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* XXIX, 3 (1985), 231-257.

Wilson-Kastner, P., "Grace as Participation in the Divine Life in the Theology of Augustine of Hippo," *Augustinian Studies* VII (1976), 135-152.

Index

ACADEMICS 20
Adam 23, 27, 77, 82f., 87f., 91, 97, 100, 108, 110, 119, 184, 189, 192, 199f., 201, 215
Aiken H.D. i
Alcuin of York 42, 65
Altaner, P. 171, 212
Ambrosiaster 59, 191, 212, 214
amor sapientiae 8
analogia entis 107, 113, 152
Anastasios of Rome 181
anima mediante 229
ὁ ἀναμνησις 154
ὁ ἀποκατάσις 175, 183
Apollinaris of Laodicea 230
Aquinas, T. 51, 52, 69, 113, 124f., 221, 270
Archmandrite Sergy 66
Argenti, E. 55
Armstrong, A.H. 9f.
Augustine of Hippo
beatific vision 248
Christ 226, 227-231, 253
Church 209, 234-238, 245
cosmogeny 141, 228, 263
faith/reason 129-141, 153, 173f
filioque 2, 48, 53f. 146f., 168-171
hertical rites 78, 116
grace 122f., 177, 187f., 197-209
monergism 31, 84, 205 (see grace)
Neo-Platonism 8, 10, 58, 138f., 142-152, 165, 186, 239
original sin 23, 116, 118, 186-190, 191, 200, 213, 217
philosophy 8f., 15, 120f., 130-134, 136
predestination 31, 41, 180, 190-197, 206f., 217, 245
rationes seminales 140, 163, 263
sacraments (mysteries) 188f., 198, 203, 238-246, 256, 260, 263
scientia/sapientia 155

soteriology 231-234, 257
theophanies 127, 246-249
traducianism 184, 211
Trinity (God) 142f., 146f., 158, 161, 165, 167, 174
Aurelius of Carthage 27

BARLAAM OF CALABRIA 49, 68, 112, 135
Barrois, G. 175
Benson, E.W. 116
Boniface II of Rome 41
Bonner, G. 176f.
Boulgaris, E., 55
Bouyer, L. 121
Boyer, C. 162-163
Brightman, F.E. 67
Broché, F. 258
Brown, P. 59
Buonaiuti, E. 214

CAESARIUS OF ARLES 40
Calvin, J. 1, 12, 219, 258, 273
Campanian Calendar 66
Cappuyns, D.M. 46
"Carolingian Renaissance" 41
Celestine of Rome 32, 60f., 126
Chadwick, H. 22, 165, 185
Chadwick, O. 65
Charles the Bald 43
Charlemagne 42
Chrysostomos of Etna 12f.
Coelestius 26, 27
Consentius 130f.
Copelston, F. 155, 166
Councils (Synods)
Arles (475) 37
Carthage 26, 27, 29, 116, 127
Chalcedon (451) 224, 233
Constantinople 40, 249, 270
Douzy (856) 46
Ephesos (431) 29, 32, 53
Florence (1439) 47, 51, 70
Jassy (1642) 270
Jerusalem (1672) 270
Lyons (480) 36
Mainz (848) 45
Nicea 53, 64, 65, 42, 166f.
Orange (529) 40
Paris (829) 42
Quierzy (853) 46
Trullo (553) 40
Valence 41, 46
creatio ex nihilo 9
credo ut intelligam 9
Cyril Loukaris of Constantinople 55

DANIELIDES, I. 5

Danielou, J. 115, 156, 175
deification (θεωσις)
Augustine 69, 176f.
Fathers 50f., 69, 88f., 92, 99, 124, 252
de Vogüé, A. 121
Devil (Satan) 75, 87f. 90f., 95, 120
Descartes, R. 136
disciplina arcani 187
Donatists 24f.
Dositheos of Jerusalem 55, 273
Doukakis, K. 6
Duckett, E.S. 66
Dudden, F.H. 64, 118, 122
Dugmore, C.W. 115
Dumont, C. 115

ECUMENIOS 126, 127
Eibel, H. 186
election
see predestination
Eliades, M. 260
Engels, J. 261
Ennodius 61
ἐπικλησις 244
Eusebios of Caesarea 162
Eustratiades, S. 6
Evans, R.F. 59
externa sapientia 8

FAUSTUS OF MILEVUS 20
Fabianus of Rome 182
Felix IV of Rome 40
fides quaerens intellectum 132
Fidus (Letter to) 78, 112, 116
Fitzer, J. 260
Flasch, K. 273f.
Florovsky, G. 2, 72, 267, 272
Florus of Lyons 45f.
Forms
see κόσμος νοητός
Free Will
Augustine 204f.
Patristic 76, 78, 81, 86, 93, 98
Fulgentius of Ruspe 32, 39

GELASIUS I OF ROME 38
George of Zadonsk 5
Gibbons, E. 1
Gilson, E. 14f., 164
Globoukovsky, N. 123
γνῶσις 135, 159, 226, 239
Gottschalk of Mainz (Fulda) 44, 65
grace
see Augustine
Patristic 50, 74, 76f.,

80, 85, 87, 90, 94f., 96f., 102f., 104f., 112f., 124, 125, 252
Greer, R.A. 219
Grillmeier, A. 229

HALL, N. 63
Harnack, A. 15, 63, 236
Haugh, R. 69
Hefele, C.J. 37, 63
Henry, P. 165
Hincmar of Reims 44f., 66
Hofman, F. 64
Hormisdas of Rome 39, 64, 151
Hortensius 18
Hrabanus Maurus 44

IAKOBOS THE ATHONITE 5
Ideas (see κόσμος νοητός)
imago Dei 152, 159, 164, 178
Indiculus Coelestini 60, 61

JAEGER, W. 62
Jesus Christ
see Augustine
Fathers 77, 84, 88, 91f., 201
John Maxentius 38f.
John Scotus Erigena 45f., 272
Jugie, M. 13, 56
Julian of Eclanum 30, 131, 193, 213
Jvanka, E.V. 115

κατὰ χάραν/κατ' οὐσίαν 229
Kalekas, M. 53
Kalomiros, A. 124
Kierevsky, I. 5
Kontoglou, P. 67
κοσμος νοητος 13, 107, 140, 152, 154, 166
Kourteses, G.
see St Gennadios II
Kritoboulos, M. 13
Krivosheine, B. 127

LAMPRYLLOS, C. 171
Libri Carolini 42, 272
Liebschuetz, H. 15
Liturgy of St James 49, 67
Lopukhine, A.P. 57
Lossky, V. 35, 168, 176, 178, 179
Lucidus 36f., 269
Luther, M. 2, 236, 258f.

MALLARD, H. 253
Maloney., G.A. 272
Manicheism 19f., 22f., 59, 183, 189, 191,

228, 248
Mantzouneas, E. 4f., 70, 267f.
Margounios, M. 55
Marius Victorinus 21, 138, 142-145, 166f., 228
Markus, R.A. 173, 261
Marrou, H.I. 66
Matthaios, V. 15
McWilliam-Dewart, J. 228
Menologies 56, 57
Mercator, M. 32
Mersch, E. 256
Mesolora, I. 273
Meyendorff, J. 49, 123, 127
Meyerhoff, H. ii
Moghila, P. 57
Moses the Prophet 138, 158, 196

NASH, R.H. 173
Neo-Platonism
see Platonism
notitia (impressa) 152, 154f.
Nygren, G. 180

OCTAVUS 239, 249, 259
O'Meara, J.J. 16, 212
Origen of Alexandria 28, 117, 138, 162, 175, 181-186, 197, 210-212, 215, 253, 260, 268
original sin
see Augustine
Oulter, A. 255

PARADISE OF THE FATHERS 263
Pelagius 26, 59, 64, 110, 120, 197ff., 214
Pelikan, J. 250
Peter the Great (tsar) 47, 56
Peter the Venerable 2
Phanariotes 55
Philaret of Chernigov 5
philosophy
see Augustine
Fathers 134f., 156f., 164
"highest philosophy" 103f.
Russian 72
Phipps, W.E. 64
φρόνημα (*phronema*) 223f.
Phylakes 4
Planoudes, M. 14
Platonism 130, 133, 152, 156, 185, 268
Plato 140, 157, 163, 166, 173
Plotinos 129, 135, 141, 145, 153, 162f., 169
Porphyry 163, 169
Pogodin, A. 5

Popovich, J. 252
Portalié, E. 8, 162
Possidius of Calama 17
Prat, F. 114f., 190, 213, 217
Predestination
see Augustine
Fathers 54f., 81, 94f., 106f., 109f., 114f.
Prokopovich, Th. 4, 56
Prosper of Aquitaine 40, 60, 126, 256
Prudentius of Troyes 46

RADBERTUS PASCHASIUS 44
Ranson, P. iii, 10, 68
Ratramnus of Corbie 43f., 65
Reuter, J. 15, 166f., 217
Riga, R.J. 127, 178
Rist, J.M. 214, 219
Romanides, J. 16, 68, 127, 123, 192, 215
Romans 5:12 25, 127, 192, 201, 215
Rose, S. 6, 12, 63, 71
Rufinus of Aquileia 28, 63, 181
Runciman, S. 71

ST AMBROSE OF MILAN 56, 82-84, 117, 149, 167, 171, 214, 246, 252
St Athanasios the Great 98, 123, 164, 217, 252
St Barnabas 97
St Barsanuphios 175
St Basil of Caesarea 92, 104, 165, 217, 261
St Benedict of Nursia 33, 92f., 121
St Clement of Rome 74
St Cyprian of Carthage 24, 77-79, 209, 251-252
St Cyril of Alexandria 47f., 52, 99-101, 251, 252, 262
St Cryil of Jerusalem 217, 223
St Dimitri of Rostov 57
St Dionysios of Alexandria 52
St Dionysios
the Areopagite 224, 259
St Faustus of Riez 34-38, 63
St Gennadios II
of Constantinople 52-55, 70f.
St Gennadius
of Marseilles 33, 37
St Germanos
of Constantinople 106-108, 126, 251
St Gregory of Nyssa 105f., 126, 151-161, 175, 178, 252
St Gregory I of Rome

41f., 64ff., 69, 93-96, 149f.
St Gregory II of Rome 172
St Gregory Palamas 49f., 112f., 134, 163f.
St Gregory of Sinai 226
St Gregory the Theologian 104f., 135, 165, 149f., 252
St Gregory of Tours 33
St Gregory, Wonderworker 266
St Hilarion, New Martyr 3, 241-243, 258, 261
St Hilary of Arles 34
St Hilary of Poitiers 78-91, 165, 172, 212, 250-252
St Hippolytos of Rome 77, 252, 272
St Ignatios of Antioch 97
St Innocent of Rome 63f.
St Irenaeos of Lyons 74-77, 252
St Jerome of Bethlehem 28, 33, 63, 81f., 116f., 172, 197
St John Cassian 33-36, 62, 84-86, 118, 121
St John Chrysostom 36, 101, 192, 195, 213, 260
St John of Damascos 52, 108-110, 263
St John the Grammarian 67f.
St John Maximovitch 5
St Justin Maryr 97f.
St Justinian (emperor) 40, 48
St Leo the Great 48, 91f., 120, 172, 232-234, 252, 256
St Leontios of Byzantium 48
St Lupus of Troyes 34
St Makarios the Great 98f.
St Makrina 106
St Mark of Ephesos 51f., 69f.
St Maximos the Confessor 227, 251, 252, 267
St Monica of Hippo 18, 22
St Nicetas of Remesiana 33, 172
St Nikodemos Hagioretes 5, 13f., 55, 226
St Patrick of Ireland 34
St Paulinus of Nola 32, 86-88, 119, 172, 214
St Peter Chrysologus 88f., 119, 252
St Photios the Great 47, 49, 109f., 126, 170, 216, 269
St Polycarp of Smyrna 97

St Symeon Metaphrastes 56, 164
St Symeon of Thessalonica 251
St Theophilos of Antioch 97, 253
St Tikhon of Zadonsk 4
St Valerian of Cimiez 89-91
St Vincent of Lerins 33, 59, 60
Salaville, S. 49
salvation
 See Augustine: predestination
 See Fathers: deification
Schaff, P. 60
Schmemann, A. 259
Schroers, H. 66
Seeberg, R. 29, 65
Sellers, R.V. 256
Semi-Pelagians 34, 35, 37, 60, 62, 63
Sherwood, P. 291
Souter, A. 214
Stauffer, E. 215
Straw, C. 64
Switalski, B. 162
synergy (synergism) 37, 81, 84, 85, 92f., 99, 104, 116, 178, 195
Synodikon 139
TCHETI MINEI 57
Tertullian 252, 262
Ternus, J. 255
theandric 251
theanthropy 224, 227
Theodore of Mopsuestia 219, 229, 254
Thornton, J. 6, 12
Tixeront, J. 62
traditores 24
Trigg, J.W. 210
Tychonius 25

UNCREATED ENERGIES
 see St Gregory Palamas
 see grace
 see deification
ὑπερούσιος 107, 159, 178

VAN DER MEER, P. 212
Velimirovic, N. 6
Venerable Bede 56, 66
Volusian 229

WALLACE-HADRILL, J.M. 15, 52
Ware, T. 71, 124
Warfield, B.B. 15
Weaver, D. 216
Weigel, G. 61, 63
Whitley, W.T. 123, 125
Wiggers, G.F. 214
Williams, N.P. 62, 86, 117, 205, 210, 213, 218, 250
Wilson-Kastner, R. 69, 177

YANNARAS, C. 69

ZEPHYRINOS OF ROME 182
Zosimus of Rome 29f., 59

TEXTS AND STUDIES IN RELIGION

1. Elizabeth A. Clark, **Clement's Use of Aristotle: The Aristotelian Contribution to Clement of Alexandria's Refutation of Gnosticism**
2. Richard DeMaria, **Communal Love at Oneida: A Perfectionist Vision of Authority, Property and Sexual Order**
3. David F. Kelly, **The Emergence of Roman Catholic Medical Ethics in North America: An Historical-Methodological-Bibliographical Study**
4. David Rausch, **Zionism Within Early American Fundamentalism, 1878-1918: A Convergence of Two Traditions**
5. Janine Marie Idziak, **Divine Command Morality: Historical and Contemporary Readings**
6. Marcus Braybrooke, **Inter-Faith Organizations, 1893-1979: An Historical Directory**
7. Louis William Countryman, **The Rich Christian in the Church of the Early Empire: Contradictions and Accommodations**
8. Irving Hexham, (ed.) **The Irony of Apartheid: The Struggle for National Independence of Afrikaner Calvinism Against British Imperialism**
9. Michael D. Ryan, **Human Responses to the Holocaust: Perpetrators and Victims, Bystanders and Resisters**
10. G. Stanley Kane, **Anselm's Doctrine of Freedom and Will**
11. Bruce Bubacz, **St. Augustine's Theory of Knowledge: A Contemporary Analysis**
12. Anne Llewellyn Barstow, **Married Priests and the Reforming Papacy: The Eleventh-Century Debates**
13. Denis Janz (ed.), **Three Reformation Catechisms: Catholic, Anabaptist, Lutheran**
14. David A. Rausch, **Messianic Judaism: Its History, Theology, and Polity**
15. Ernest E. Best, **Religion and Society in Transition: The Church and Social Change in England, 1560-1850**
16. Donald V. Stump *et al.*, ***Hamartia:* The Concept of Error in the Western Tradition Essays in Honor of John M. Crossett**
17. Louis Meyer, **Eminent Hebrew Christians of the Nineteenth Century: Brief Biographical Sketches,** David Rausch (ed.)
18. James Jenkins, **The Records and Recollections of James Jenkins**
19. Joseph R. Washington, Jr., **Anti-Blackness in English Religion 1500-1800**
20. Joyce E. Salisbury, **Iberian Popular Religion 600 B.C. to 700 A.D.: Celts, Visigoths, Romans**
21. Longinus, ***On the Sublime***, James A. Arieti and John M. Crossett (trans.)
22. James Gollnick, ***Flesh* as Transformation Symbol in the Theology of Anselm of Canterbury: Historical and Transpersonal Perspectives**
23. William Lane Craig, **The Historical Argument for the Resurrection of Jesus During the Deist Controversy**
24. Steven H. Simpler, **Roland H. Bainton: An Examination of His Reformation Historiography**
25. Charles W. Brockwell, Jr., **Bishop Reginald Pecock and the Lancastrian Church: Securing the Foundations of Cultural Authority**
26. Sebastian Franck, **Sebastian Franck: 280 Paradoxes or Wondrous Sayings,** E. J. Furcha (trans.)
27. James Heft, **John XXII and Papal Teaching Authority**
28. Shelley Baranowski, **The Confessing Church, Conservative Elites, and The Nazi State**
29. Jan Lindhardt, **Martin Luther: Knowledge and Mediation in the Renaissance**
30. Kenneth L. Campbell, **The Intellectual Struggle of the English Papists in the Seventeenth Century: The Catholic Dilemma**
31. William R. Everdell, **Christian Apologetics in France, 1750-1800: The Roots of Romantic Religion**
32. Paul J. Morman, **Noël Aubert De Versé (1642-1714): A Study in the Concept of Toleration**
33. Nigel M. de S. Cameron, **Biblical Higher Criticism and the Defense of Infallibilism in 19th-Century Britain**
34. Samuel J. Rogal, **John Wesley's London: A Guidebook 1738-1791**
35. André Séguenny, **The Christology of Caspar Schwenckfeld: Spirit and Flesh in the Process of Life Transformation,** Peter C. Erb and Simone Nieuwolt (trans.)
36. Donald E. Demaray, **The Innovation of John Newton (1725-1807): Synergism of Word and Music in Eighteenth Century Evangelism**
37. Thomas Chase, **The English Religious Lexis**
38. R.Gordan Moyles, **A Bibliography of Salvation Army Literature in English (1865-1987)**
39. Vincent A. Lapomarda, **The Jesuits and the Third Reich**
40. Susan Drain, **The Anglican Church in 19th Century Britain: Hymns Ancient and Modern (1860-1875)**
41. Aegidius of Rome, **On Ecclesiastical Power: De Ecclesiastica Potestate,** Arthur P. Monahan (trans.)
42. John R. Eastman, **Papal Abdication in Later Medieval Thought**
43. Paul Badham (ed.), **Religion, State, and Society in Modern Britain**

44. Hans Denck, **Selected Writings of Hans Denck, 1500-1527,** E. J. Furcha (trans.)
45. Dietmar Lage, **Martin Luther on the *Imitatio Christi* and *Conformitas Christi* and Their Relationship To Good Works**
46. Jean Calvin, **Sermons on Jeremiah by Jean Calvin,** Blair Reynolds (trans.)
47. Jean Calvin, **Sermons on Micah by Jean Calvin,** Blair Reynolds (trans.)
48. Alexander Sándor Unghváry, **The Hungarian Protestant Reformation in the Sixteenth Century Under the Ottoman Impact: Essays and Profiles**
49. Daniel B. Clendenin & W. David Buschart (eds.), **Scholarship, Sacraments and Service: Historical Studies in Protestant Tradition, Essays in Honor of Bard Thompson**
50. Randle Manwaring, **A Study of Hymn-Writing and Hymn-Singing in the Christian Church**
51. John R. Schneider, **Philip Melanchthon's Rhetorical Construal of Biblical Authority: Oratio Sacra**
52. Carolinne White, **The Correspondence Between Jerome and Augustine of Hippo**
53. J.A. Loubser, **A Critical Review Of Racial Theology,** Blair Reynolds (trans.)